

EXHIBIT J

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 Adv. Case No. 08-01789-smb

4 - - - - - x

5 SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION,

6 Plaintiff.

7 v.

8 BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

9 Defendant.

10 - - - - - x

11 Adv. Case No. 10-04898-smb

12 - - - - - x

13 IRVING H. PICARD TRUSTEE FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF BERNARD L.

14 MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

15 Plaintiff.

16 v.

17 SAREN-LAWRENCE,

18 Defendant.

19 - - - - - x

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

1 - - - - - x

2 Adv. Case No. 10-04324-smb

3 - - - - - x

4 IRVING H. PICARD TRUSTEE FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF BERNARD L.
5 MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,

6 Plaintiff.

7 v.

8 ROTH et al,

9 Defendant.

10 - - - - - x

11

12 U.S. Bankruptcy Court

13 One Bowling Green

14 New York, NY 10004

15

16 March 23, 2016

17 10:40 AM

18

19

20

21

22

23 B E F O R E :

24 HON STUART M. BERNSTEIN

25 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Page 3

1 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Defendants' Motion to Quash
2 Subpoena, for Protective Order, and for Dismissal

3

4 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Motion to take Deposition of
5 Bernard L. Madoff

6

7 Hearing re: 08-01789-smb Application of Temporary
8 Restraining Order and Stay of Enforcement of Subpoenas

9

10 Hearing re: 10-04898-smb Trustee's Motion to Compel Third
11 Party to Comply with Subpoena

12

13 Hearing re: 10-04324-smb Motion of Chaitman LLP to Withdraw
14 as Counsel to Barbara Roth

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Page 4

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 CHAITMAN LLP

4 Attorney for Aaron Blecker; Helene Saren-Lawrence, et
5 al, Defendants

6 465 Park Avenue

7 New York, NY 10022

8

9 BY: GREGORY M. DEXTER

10 HELEN CHAITMAN (TELEPHONICALLY)

11

12 BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

13 Attorney for Irving H. Picard, Esq., Trustee for the
14 SIPA Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment
15 Securities LLC

16 45 Rockefeller Plaza

17 New York, NY 10111

18

19 BY: DAVID J. SHEEHAN

20 RICHARD J. BERNARD

21 SEANNA R. BROWN

22 KARIN S. JENSON

23

24

25

Page 5

1 ZEICHNER ELLMAN & KRAUSE LLP

2 Attorney for Valley National Bank

3 1211 Avenue of the Americas

4 New York, NY 10036

5

6 BY: BARRY J. GLICKMAN

7

8 SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP

9 Attorney for Picower Parties

10 919 Third Avenue

11 New York, NY 10022

12

13 BY: MARCY RESSLER HARRIS

14 MICHAEL KWON

15

16 ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:

17

18 KEVIN H. BELL

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning. Madoff.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, if you have a preference,
4 we have two things this morning: the deposition of Mr.
5 Madoff, and we also have a continuation of the order to show
6 cause.

7 THE COURT: Yeah, I had --

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, there could be three things.

9 THE COURT: Well, actually I have three related
10 motions regarding the enforcement of the subpoenas. I have
11 the motion to withdraw as a lawyer for Barbara Roth, and I
12 also have the Madoff deposition. Why don't we do the
13 subpoenas first? Who represents the defendants?

14 MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Your Honor. Gregory
15 Dexter here, Chaitman, LLP. I represent the defendants in
16 this matter. I guess we'll proceed with our motion for a
17 protective order and motions quashed. Although this motion,
18 it really came before the Court by motion for the trustee to
19 compel Valley National Bank to comply with --

20 THE COURT: Well, your motion really covers 11
21 cases and his motion only covers one, and that motion
22 overlapped with your motion in that case, so why don't you
23 go ahead?

24 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor. As we state in our
25 brief, these subpoenas seek records that the defendants do

1 not dispute. And the trustee has a position on that.

2 THE COURT: What do you mean the defendants don't
3 dispute?

4 MR. DEXTER: Well, if you look at the records that
5 the subpoenas are actually seeking, which are from 2006 to
6 2009, all of the defendants have substantially admitted
7 (indiscernible).

8 THE COURT: That is an incorrect statement. And
9 I'll deal with the subpoenas individually, but I will tell
10 you right now that with the possible exception of the
11 Wilentz case, there are substantial disputes reflected in
12 the responses to the request for admission.

13 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, I don't know how
14 you'd like to proceed. Would you like to go through each
15 one?

16 THE COURT: Tell me, you've made a motion, part of
17 your motion is the motion to dismiss the complaints in these
18 11 actions. Tell me why I should dismiss them.

19 MR. DEXTER: Well, the motion to dismiss is based
20 on the trustee's wrongful conduct, in essentially
21 representing that he would hold the subpoenas in advance,
22 providing the defendants an opportunity to answer the
23 request for admit, and when some of those defendants did
24 answer those requests to admit, the trustee nonetheless
25 proceeded, and then in other cases, where the defendants

Page 8

1 didn't even have an opportunity to answer their requests for
2 admit, the trustee proceeded nonetheless.

3 THE COURT: But your motion is predicated on the
4 violation of a court order. You rely on Rules 37(b) and
5 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. What's the
6 court order that was violated?

7 MR. DEXTER: The court order is that your ruling
8 from February 19th, in which you memorialized the trustee's
9 representation that he had made at an earlier hearing, which
10 was that the trustee would hold the subpoenas in advance, he
11 would provide the defendants an opportunity to admit their
12 request for admissions, and then we would determine whether
13 or not we would proceed or not.

14 THE COURT: But your motion is predicated on
15 letters sent the day before, isn't it? On February 18th, the
16 day before the order.

17 MR. DEXTER: The motion is predicated on a lot of
18 representations that were made, and we're all aware that
19 this is sort of a complicated procedural history.

20 THE COURT: I'll grant you that.

21 MR. DEXTER: So it wasn't just the fact that there
22 was a letter a day before a motion or anything like that.
23 But when you look at all these communications in context,
24 and you look at what they state, that these communications
25 are that the trustee was going to hold compliance in

Page 9

1 advance, provide the defendants a meaningful opportunity to
2 answer the questions --

3 THE COURT: Well, but in the case of Saren-
4 Lawrence, the responses to the requests for admissions had
5 already been served, so there was nothing to hold in advance
6 of that point, was there?

7 MR. DEXTER: Well, at that point, the trustee could
8 have said that we think these are insufficient for the
9 following reason, can you please clarify this? There are
10 procedures --

11 THE COURT: I don't think the trustee has to
12 negotiate the answers. This is the second set of responses
13 which you've served, and as I recall, colloquy, it was, that
14 the trustee would stand down for 30 days, if the answers
15 were admitted, fine, but if the trustee was dissatisfied
16 with the answers, the trustee could proceed. On their face,
17 the answers don't admit the transfers, do they?

18 MS. CHAITMAN: Your Honor, this is Helen Chaitman.
19 May I be heard on this issue?

20 THE COURT: No, Ms. Chaitman, you said that you
21 would listen, and if I had a question, I would ask you. I
22 don't entertain oral argument on the telephone on these
23 matters. Mr. Dexter is here and can answer the question.

24 MR. DEXTER: In Saren-Lawrence, the defendant
25 states that she does not dispute the transfers from 2001 to

1 the present.

2 THE COURT: To the extent they're consistent with
3 the accountant's records, right?

4 MR. DEXTER: Right, because that's all she has
5 (indiscernible) --

6 THE COURT: So first of all, though, they're the
7 records she gave to the accountant, and secondly, that
8 requires the trustee to prove his case by proving what the
9 accountant's records show. What is the admission to in that
10 case? It's still a disputed issue.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well, the trustee either has those
12 records from the accountant, or will have those records --

13 THE COURT: Why doesn't she get those records and
14 either admit or deny the transfers? They're her records.
15 Didn't she give the accountant the information regarding
16 what she'd received, and what she deposited?

17 MR. DEXTER: Right, and to the extent that those
18 records are consistent with what the trustee has, she has so
19 indicated. And there are only three very minor areas of
20 dispute. And those disputes would be resolved by the
21 information that Valley National Bank has produced, or will
22 produce. Therefore, there is no dispute.

23 THE COURT: That's what you said.

24 MR. DEXTER: That is why I say, but the records
25 that Valley National has produced, or will produce, will

Page 11

1 resolve these very minor dispute in the Saren-Lawrence case.

2 THE COURT: What about the other cases?

3 MR. DEXTER: Okay, we can take it one by one. In
4 the Roman case, the defendants there do not dispute the
5 deposits and withdrawals, as evidenced by the trustee's
6 records from --

7 THE COURT: Yeah, but they denied the receipt of
8 the \$150,000 withdrawal on April 2nd, 2007, and the \$125,000
9 withdrawal on March 19th, 2008. So how can you say they
10 don't deny it?

11 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, there are so many
12 documents at issue here. I don't have a copy of those. Could
13 you read that in context for me? Because it may be just that
14 they have a problem with a term of (indiscernible), which is
15 principal.

16 THE COURT: No, I understand the denial of the
17 characterization of certain things as principal. That's not
18 an issue that concerns me. But let me just see. I'm looking
19 at -- this is Robert Roman's answers. Number 16, admit that
20 the withdrawal from the account made on or about April 2,
21 2007 in the amount of \$150,000 was received by Robert Roman.
22 Answer, denied, see Answer Number 15. Number 22, admit that
23 the withdrawal from the account made on or about March 19th,
24 2008, in the amount of \$125,000 was received by Robert
25 Roman. Denied, see answer to Number 21. And then he also

Page 12

1 says --

2 MR. DEXTER: Could you explain what the answers are
3 of 15 and 21?

4 THE COURT: Just a minute, just a minute. Then he
5 also says, Request Number 27, admit that \$410,000 in excess
6 of principal was withdrawn from the account between December
7 11, 2006 and December 11, 2008. Answer, denied. Then he said
8 the entire account consisted of principal, but then he said,
9 moreover, the trustee has failed to credit the responding
10 party with \$140,000 made in deposits made into his account
11 in the period following December 11th, 2006. So you put
12 those into issue. You put the trustee's records into issue.
13 You're saying that the two most significant withdrawals were
14 never received, isn't that what it says?

15 MR. DEXTER: It's saying, please see Number 15, and
16 please see Number 21.

17 THE COURT: So what does that say?

18 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, could you tell me? I'm not
19 sure, because quite honestly, I don't have that.

20 THE COURT: I think that's the defendant's theory,
21 that she doesn't receive money that she uses to pay taxes,
22 which I'm not quite sure I understand, but I'm --
23 particularly since I've been told they got refunds for these
24 taxes. But look, what else?

25 MR. DEXTER: With respect to the Romans?

Page 13

1 THE COURT: Next, which do you want to talk about
2 next?

3 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, I think that the
4 substance of their admissions is that they made everything
5 from 2008 in 2008. They're not going to admit loaded request
6 for admissions the trustee puts in. That would require the
7 Romans to accept certain terms of (indiscernible) that the
8 trustee knows are disputed, and the Romans can't really
9 admit to anything more than that.

10 THE COURT: Okay, but nobody says they have to
11 admit to something that they in good faith have to admit to.
12 But then if they can admit to it, it's a disputed issue, and
13 if it's the trustee's burden, the trustee will have to prove
14 it. But they specifically deny the receipt of the \$150,000
15 and the \$125,000.

16 MR. DEXTER: I don't think they do. I think they
17 dispute the way that it's characterized, because they have
18 admitted all deposits and withdrawals from 2000 to 2008.

19 THE COURT: Okay, but we're arguing -- but the
20 trustees said, admit you receive this money, and they say
21 no. And it's a withdrawal that's reflected on the trustee's
22 records.

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, admit that your received it for
24 the benefit of --

25 THE COURT: That's a different question. I didn't

Page 14

1 read you that question. That's another question that raises
2 a legal issue, whether you receive money that you use to pay
3 taxes. This is just a straight-out request for an admission
4 that you receive the money. Let's go on to other orders.

5 MR. DEXTER: Wilentz.

6 THE COURT: Wilentz, I had an issue with the
7 trustee on that one. When the trustee responds, but -- by
8 the way, with the exception of Saren-Lawrence, all of these
9 defendants have asserted a defense that I guess to the
10 extent they were required by law or contract to pay the
11 money over to a third party, they didn't receive it. Kind
12 of, I guess, a conduit type of a theory. So doesn't that put
13 all of the transfers out into question? As well as the
14 transfers in, I guess.

15 MR. DEXTER: Well, Your Honor, the rules of federal
16 procedure have never been that if you raise an affirmative
17 defense because you're required to raise it in answer,
18 otherwise it's waived, that the complaining party can
19 subpoena any record they want, and get evidence of anything
20 they want.

21 THE COURT: But why they can't get evidence related
22 to that affirmative defense? Nobody forced you to assert it?

23 MR. DEXTER: Well, the evidence that they are
24 seeking through these subpoenas would not be in any way
25 relevant or helpful to getting that information.

1 THE COURT: Why not? They know the universe of
2 outflows, and then they could ask the person in every case
3 what was the basis of the requirement to make that payment.
4 Were you holding it as a conduit? Were you an agent that
5 received it for somebody else? You've raised that issue.

6 MR. DEXTER: Well, if they get the financial
7 records, that's not going to give them the contract, that's
8 not going to --

9 THE COURT: Well, but then they can ask the person
10 about each withdrawal.

11 MR. DEXTER: But aren't there less burdensome ways
12 to do that?

13 THE COURT: I don't even know what that defense
14 means? What does it mean?

15 MR. DEXTER: It's our burden to prove that
16 affirmative defense. And if we don't produced the evidence
17 to establish that affirmative defense, it's going to be
18 dropped.

19 THE COURT: But if you do, what do we do? Stop the
20 trial at that point and now tell the trustee he can take
21 discovery?

22 MR. DEXTER: No, because throughout discovery, any
23 evidence that we're going to have to put on trial, we're
24 going to have to produce. So before we get to trial,
25 everyone's going to know whether we have the information to

1 establish these affirmative defenses or not.

2 THE COURT: Look, you asserted in most cases,
3 something like 42 affirmative defenses. If you assert the
4 defense, it raises the issues are encompassed in the
5 defense, and discovery is appropriate in those issues.
6 Nobody forced you to raise those.

7 MR. DEXTER: Discovery is appropriate, and
8 throughout the course of discovery, we're going to produce
9 the documents that support those affirmative defenses. We
10 don't see why the trustee has to be granted the most
11 burdensome remedy possible for us to establish those
12 affirmative defenses.

13 THE COURT: How is that burdensome to you? You not
14 being asked to produce anything.

15 MR. DEXTER: It's going to reveal personal
16 financial records of the defendants, for 99 percent of the
17 transactions are not going to be relevant to this case at
18 all.

19 THE COURT: That may be true. We don't know that,
20 but the question is who in the first instance is going to
21 make that determination?

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, we think it should be a neutral
23 mediator.

24 THE COURT: Why a neutral mediator?

25 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, that would more

1 appropriately protect the defendants' confidentiality
2 interests. It would be exposed to thousands of people, it
3 wouldn't be exposed to the trustee's hundreds of attorneys.

4 THE COURT: BUT the trustee has agreed to hold it
5 in confidence, pursuant to the litigation protection order.
6 Yes, it'll be seen by the trustee's attorneys, but so what?
7 If you're going to show it to a third party, what's the
8 problem of showing it to the trustee under a promise of
9 confidentiality?

10 MR. DEXTER: Because once we produce these records
11 to the trustee, then they're going to use that information
12 to frame complaints against subsequent transfers.

13 THE COURT: It's a different issue.

14 MR. DEXTER: Well, it all comes together.

15 THE COURT: Just a minute. When Ms. Chaitman said
16 she was going to make this motion, I said that one of the
17 questions I had was if you even had standing to object to a
18 third-party subpoena on the basis that it was seeking
19 subsequent transfer information. Irrelevant information,
20 let's just call it that. And that's not addressed in the
21 motion.

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, there is standing to object when
23 a subpoena seeks the personal financial records.

24 THE COURT: I agree with you on that, but now
25 you're talking about something else. You're talking about

Page 18

1 subsequent transfers (indiscernible) before the Court. You
2 don't know who they are.

3 MR. DEXTER: It's clear that the defendants have
4 standing. At that point, can they take the argument further?
5 It's established they have standing, because these are
6 personal records.

7 THE COURT: What does the law say about a party's
8 standing to object to a third-party subpoena on grounds of
9 relevance? Isn't there Second Circuit authority on this?

10 MR. DEXTER: On grounds of relevance? I know that
11 the law says quite clearly that if the financial records are
12 subpoenaed, you have standing.

13 THE COURT: That's a different issue, that's a
14 privacy issue.

15 MR. DEXTER: Right, and that gives us standing.

16 THE COURT: You're talking, we started this by
17 talking about subsequent transfer.

18 MR. DEXTER: Right.

19 THE COURT: So what is your standing to object to
20 the discovery of subsequent transfer information, in this
21 context?

22 MR. DEXTER: As Ms. Chaitman has already state don
23 the record, and as I thought this Court was satisfied, we
24 represent some of those subsequent transferees. And to
25 protect --

1 THE COURT: We don't even know who they are.

2 MR. DEXTER: Well, I don't know how we could reveal
3 that information.

4 THE COURT: Then how do I know you represent them?

5 MR. DEXTER: Because we make the motion to dismiss,
6 which Your Honor granted.

7 THE COURT: There was only one case, I think, of
8 all of them, in which there was a subsequent transferee
9 issue, wasn't it? Which was one that?

10 MS. JENSON: Halpern, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Can I ask you something else?

12 MR. DEXTER: Certainly.

13 THE COURT: If the trustee couldn't get the
14 subsequent transferee as a matter of discovery, couldn't he
15 get it in a Rule 2004 examination?

16 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, the trustee already had
17 that opportunity. The trustee could have waited in filing
18 these adversary proceedings. He could have obtained that
19 information in a 2004 proceeding.

20 THE COURT: So why can't he do it now?

21 MR. DEXTER: As I understand, Rule 2004 is his
22 opportunity to do that has passed, with the filing of the
23 adversary suit.

24 THE COURT: Under the pending proceeding rule,
25 that's only if can get the information as a matter of

Page 20

1 discovery, to proceed the defendant's procedural rights. If
2 you're telling me that he can't get the discovery in the
3 proceeding, then the pending proceeding rule doesn't bar us
4 getting the discovery through 2004, does it?

5 MR. DEXTER: I would have to defer to Ms. Chaitman
6 on that one, if you would allow her, because being new to
7 this case, that's just not something that I know, quite
8 frankly.

9 THE COURT: Well, it's just a principle of law.
10 It's not nothing specific to do with this case. All right.
11 Anything else?

12 MR. DEXTER: Would you like to continue to proceed
13 with each individual represented?

14 THE COURT: Well, all right. Wilentz, we were
15 talking about Wilentz, and in Wilentz, I think Wilentz did
16 admit the two transfers. I'll deal with the trustee on that
17 one -- wait a minute. Let me see if I can find Wilentz. Oh,
18 all right. Wilentz admits to the transfers, and there were
19 no deposits, I think, during the relevant period. So we'll
20 deal with the trustee on that one on why he needs more
21 information. It may be because of the affirmative defenses,
22 I don't know. Can I ask you a question about the Shapiro
23 cases?

24 MR. DEXTER: Certainly.

25 THE COURT: And maybe the trustee has the answer.

Page 21

1 As I understand it, Mr. Shapiro is deceased?

2 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Are the initial transferees Mr. Shapiro
4 individually, or some sort of entity in which he has an
5 interest. I'm just wondering what the status of those
6 proceedings are.

7 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm not as close to that as perhaps,
8 some of my colleagues are here, but as I understand it,
9 there are now new representatives being brought in to each --
10 - and they're all family members, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: So what's the -- I know that you never
12 served request for admissions --

13 MR. SHEEHAN: No, we didn't.

14 THE COURT: Bin those cases. But you're seeking to
15 enforce the subpoenas in those cases.

16 MR. SHEEHAN: That's right.

17 MR. DEXTER: My understanding is that that's
18 actually reversed.

19 THE COURT: Well, I looked at your chart.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: I just got told that I was wrong.

21 THE COURT: According to the chart that I got from
22 Ms. Chaitman in connection with the TRO, no discovery was
23 served in the four Shapiro cases, and I did see a letter, a
24 February 18th letter which sought to enforce, compel
25 compliance with subpoena in those cases. What's the status

Page 22

1 of those cases, what's the status of discovery?

2 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was
3 listening to my colleague. I was right in my answer, by the
4 way. We have served subpoenas in Shapiro.

5 THE COURT: And you're insisting on compliance with
6 the subpoenas even though you haven't served requests for
7 admissions?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, our position is, and the reason
9 I'm here today is for this reason. We're no longer serving
10 requests for admissions in Helen Chaitman cases, because
11 it's a waste of time. I don't have to serve request for
12 admissions. If Your Honor recalls, the reason we serve
13 requests for admissions goes back months. Your Honor
14 announced from this bench that these are strict viability
15 cases. Let's resolve these issues. We agree. We have served
16 requests for admission on literally hundreds of defendants,
17 and in many instances have achieved stipulations such as the
18 Cohen matter before Your Honor.

19 We've worked out with hundreds of counsel all of
20 these. This particular instance has turned into a series of
21 motions that Your Honor has been entertaining over the
22 period of three months. We're not advancing the cause of the
23 case or otherwise. We will no longer service. We withdraw
24 all requests for admissions to Mrs. Chaitman's clients,
25 effective today, and she will never receive another request

Page 23

1 for admission with regard to any other clients. We will rely
2 upon the trustee's books and records.

3 And with regard to the subsequence, we will
4 indeed, as Your Honor has just queried counsel on, we intend
5 to use 2004 to get all the information you need. Every day
6 that goes by, records are disappearing. That's what counsel
7 is relying upon. Mrs. Chaitman even alluded to that at the
8 last hearing that she knows those records are disappearing.
9 So we need at this point, two things -- no more request for
10 admissions, we get 2004 exams with regard to all of the
11 banks so we can pursue, as we have every right to, under
12 550, subsequent transferees here. And I disagree,
13 respectfully, that Rule 26 shouldn't bar us. I think we
14 should be allowed under Rule 26.

15 THE COURT: No, no that's not the question. The
16 question is the representation was made that you wouldn't do
17 certain things before you had served requests for admission.
18 So what you're telling me now, is on a going forward basis,
19 you're withdrawing that (indiscernible).

20 MR. SHEEHAN: I am withdrawing that, because it got
21 perverted, from my perspective, to the point where that
22 became the issue, who did what when, as opposed to what
23 answers we got. And the answers we got, respectfully, as
24 Your Honor has found on (indiscernible) through the counsel
25 this morning were meaningless. So they're not helpful to us.

Page 24

1 We will go ahead and quite frankly, my intention is to move,
2 in all those cases, for summary judgment. I don't think she
3 has a valid defense to any of this. So we're going to
4 expedite these cases, at this point.

5 THE COURT: All right. Okay, all right. Ms.
6 Chaitman, I'll hear from you, since your name has come up in
7 that last discussion, if you want to say anything.

8 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, I would, Your Honor. Thank you
9 very much. First of all, it wasn't simply a representation
10 made in chambers, it was an agreement that was made in
11 chambers that was a tri-party agreement. You acknowledged
12 it, and I acknowledged it, and therefore it wasn't something
13 that the trustee in his whim, or in his convenience could
14 withdraw. And then I think the conference was on January
15 28th, and then on February 16th, I may have the date wrong,
16 but I think it was that date, in Court, and Your Honor on
17 the record said which procedures should be followed, which
18 was that the subpoena should be held in advance, until the
19 defendants were given an opportunity to admit or deny the
20 transcripts.

21 And that was an order that the Court entered,
22 orally, in Court, and the trustee then decided that it
23 wasn't applicable to the trustee. And now we hear that the
24 trustee is changing the Court's order, and I just don't
25 believe that the trustee has that power, Your Honor. I mean,

Page 25

1 certainly I don't think the Court would accept my coming in
2 and saying, "Well, Judge, you ordered something, but I've
3 changed my mind about it, and I'm not going to comply with
4 the order."

5 So that's number one, and number two, in the case
6 of Mr. Lawrence, specifically, this is a situation where
7 Valley National Bank has already produced all documents
8 reflecting transfers to and from Madoff. So if that were the
9 trustee's interest, he has it already. There is no dispute
10 that those documents have been produced. In addition, Valley
11 National Bank has no further records to clarify the three
12 exceptions that Ms. Saren-Lawrence had in her response to
13 the request to admit. So she basically conceded everything
14 of which there's documentary evidence within Valley National
15 Bank. And Jim Lawrence, who is my client, and who has
16 standing, because it's a joint account, and his bank records
17 have been subpoenaed, he certainly has standing to move to
18 quash that subpoena to the extent that it seeks documents
19 which have no relevance, other than to establishing whether
20 he was a subsequent transferee.

21 THE COURT: Ms. Chaitman, can I just interrupt you
22 about Mr. Lawrence, though?

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Sure.

24 THE COURT: Why wouldn't he be a subsequent
25 transferee when the money is being put into the joint

1 account?

2 MS. CHAITMAN: Because if it was used by Helene to
3 support herself, it was used for her. The subsequent
4 transferee account, you'd have to trace how the money was
5 used. The thing is --

6 THE COURT: No, you don't. Couldn't he have written
7 a check on that account of the entire amount? Didn't he have
8 dominion and control of everything in the account? They both
9 did.

10 MS. CHAITMAN: Yes. He might not have used it. It's
11 a question of who actually received the money, it's not a
12 question of who had --

13 THE COURT: Aren't there cases that say a deposit
14 like that into a joint account renders the joint owner a
15 subsequent transferee?

16 MS. CHAITMAN: I'm not aware of any, Your Honor,
17 and I think that the issue here, what the trustee is doing
18 is quite extraordinary, and only exists in the context of
19 Ponzi scheme, where you go after people who receive the
20 money. And then it's a question of who actually enjoyed the
21 benefit of the money. And I think that's we're going to into
22 uncharted territory in the Second Circuit on this issue. But
23 focusing simply on the subsequent transferee issue,
24 certainly Mr. Lawrence has standing to object to the
25 subpoena of all his bank records, which has no purpose other

Page 27

1 than to permit the trustee to take discovery to which he's
2 not entitled.

3 THE COURT: But aren't his bank records her bank
4 records, because they have a joint account? In other words
5 the trustee -- this is why I don't do this on the phone --
6 in other words, the trustee has not subpoenaed his personal
7 records, he subpoenaed her records, and she happens to have
8 a joint account with him.

9 MS. CHAITMAN: Right, but the trustee has gotten
10 everything from those records the trustee is legitimately
11 entitled to. And if the trustee is now saying he's going to
12 use Rule 2004 to take discovery which is not permissible
13 under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, that raises a
14 very, very interesting question, because I don't believe
15 that Rule 2004 can be used to circumvent the prohibitions
16 that have been announced from the United States Supreme
17 Court on. If Rule 2004 was appropriate --

18 THE COURT: What prohibition is that?

19 MS. CHAITMAN: The prohibition against taking
20 discovery to frame a complaint. The trustee had --

21 THE COURT: But that's exactly what Rule 2004 is
22 for.

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Yes, but once he files an adversary
24 proceeding, I do not believe he's entitled to take ex parte
25 discovery, and that's precisely what he's doing.

Page 28

1 THE COURT: Well, it's an interesting question and
2 I don't have it before us, but I raised it, as to whether or
3 not the trustee could get 2004 discovery, on the theory that
4 the discovery would not violate the pending proceeding
5 ruling. I guess we can deal with that at a future date.

6 MS. CHAITMAN: But I think that we've come to a
7 point, Your Honor, where that issue has to be briefed and
8 determined, because I think --

9 THE COURT: Do you want me to treat his requests
10 also a pursuant to Rule 2004?

11 MS. CHAITMAN: Well, I'd like to have the
12 opportunity to brief it, Your Honor, because it hasn't been
13 raised before today, and we haven't briefed that issue.

14 THE COURT: Fair enough. Anything else?

15 MR. DEXTER: Would you like me to continue each
16 defendant here, Your Honor?

17 THE COURT: Sure. We talked about Wilentz, we've
18 talked about Saren-Lawrence, we've talked about Shapiro --
19 now let me go to Roth. What's the status of Roth? Have you
20 granted an extension of some sort?

21 MR. DEXTER: Can we just circle back to Shapiro for
22 a sec?

23 THE COURT: No, no.

24 MR. DEXTER: All right.

25 THE COURT: And is it an open-needed extension, or?

1 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, because Roth is in the process,
2 obviously, Ms. Chaitman is both representing and withdrawing
3 at the same time.

4 THE COURT: Well, right now, she's representing
5 her.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, and in that context, we've
7 agreed, as we did the last time we were together, that we're
8 not going to do anything here until we have a resolution
9 here today. So yes, it's extended without date until such
10 time -- but in this case --

11 THE COURT: Why don't you do the same thing with
12 Shapiro, since Shapiro apparently is going to have new
13 representatives, and maybe new lawyers.

14 MR. SHEEHAN: Right. But what we're doing is we're
15 withdrawing all the requests for admissions. There's no need
16 for extensions. We're done. This is a waste of time.

17 THE COURT: So what extension are you granting in
18 Roth?

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, the Roth extension is that we
20 would not move forward on anything until such time as there
21 is a resolution here today. We wouldn't move to compel, we
22 wouldn't force the subpoenas, we wouldn't do any of those
23 things, given them an opportunity to answer the requests for
24 admissions. In this case they're without counsel, so they
25 can't really answer them, so obviously there's no pressure

Page 30

1 on them. But the point of the matter is, Your Honor, that
2 there are no requests for admissions after today. And if I
3 could be heard for one minute?

4 THE COURT: Well, let me let Mr. Dexter finish --

5 MR. SHEEHAN: All right. Because there are a lot of
6 things said by Ms. Chaitman I disagree with.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 MR. DEXTER: Just one thing on Shapiro. I think the
9 understanding has been very confusing as to what has been
10 served, what hasn't been served. Just so we're clear, the
11 trustee has served subpoenas, but not requests for admission
12 --

13 THE COURT: And he says he's not going to. He says
14 because this will all just cause more litigation, and it
15 hasn't produced everything, and it's a waste of time, and
16 it's getting expensive for everybody.

17 MR. DEXTER: So is he going to hold compliance for
18 the subpoenas in event?

19 THE COURT: No, no.

20 MR. DEXTER: He's going to proceed with the --

21 THE COURT: That's what he's saying.

22 MR. DEXTER: Well, of course we object to that,
23 Your Honor, because it totally contravenes the entire
24 understanding the parties had for the months of January
25 through February, leading up to this motion practice. But

Page 31

1 we'll put that objection on the record. And we think a court
2 order should be entered preventing the trustee from
3 proceeding with compliance with those subpoenas. He hasn't
4 provided an opportunity to answer requests of admissions. He
5 hasn't been able to, it's not his fault. But that proceeding
6 with the subpoenas, compliance with subpoenas entirely
7 contravenes the parties' understanding of the previous
8 months.

9 THE COURT: But the trustee is arguing that this
10 procedure that was set up that underlay the representation
11 just hasn't worked.

12 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, we disagree.

13 THE COURT: Okay, so if I agree that it hasn't
14 worked, do you think it's appropriate to simply let the
15 trustee go out and enforce the subpoenas, without serving
16 any further requests for admission? And if not, why not?

17 MR. DEXTER: Well, we don't think that the trustee
18 should be entitled to serve these subpoenas at all. I mean,
19 they're seeking personal financial records that are highly
20 irrelevant, that are highly --

21 THE COURT: That's a different issue. That's an
22 objection to the subpoena. All I'm saying is you say that
23 the trustee should not be able to enforce any subpoenas in
24 the Shapiro cases, because the trustee has not yet served
25 the request for admission, and there was a representation

Page 32

1 that he would not seek to enforce the subpoenas until he did
2 so, and there was time to respond, right?

3 MR. DEXTER: Correct.

4 THE COURT: Okay. The trustee now tells me, and I
5 tend to agree, that this process has not worked. It hasn't
6 accomplished its purpose, because it's been just additional
7 litigation, letter-writing -- I have several motions before
8 me now, and the value of the responses is such that they
9 don't do anything. So why shouldn't the trustee, on that
10 basis -- and putting aside the privacy issue for a minute --
11 be permitted to seek the bank records?

12 MR. DEXTER: Because the Court's ruling on March
13 9th that the Shapiro temporary restraining order was denied
14 was based on the understanding that there was no outstanding
15 discovery, and that was moot, or whatever procedural way you
16 want to frame that, and now that's not true at all. And now
17 he's --

18 THE COURT: There is no outstanding discovery.

19 MR. DEXTER: Right, but there's is no outstanding
20 discovery, but there is no outstanding subpoena.

21 THE COURT: But there was no urgency at that point,
22 because the trustee said he would stand down.

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, and we think that a court order
24 should be entered that requires the trustee to stand down.
25 And I don't disagree that --

1 THE COURT: Well, in other words, that among other
2 things, says that the trustee is required to serve a request
3 for admission in every case.

4 MR. DEXTER: Well, I think we already have a court
5 order that says the trustee would serve a request for
6 admission, allow the defendants a chance to respond, and
7 would not proceed with enforcing compliance with subpoenas
8 until that happened. And now the trustee is saying, "No,
9 that really wasn't a court order, I could just change my
10 mind."

11 THE COURT: Well, maybe he's just asking, to the
12 extent it's a court order, to change it, because it just
13 hasn't worked. There's been a frustration of the bencher, in
14 commercial language.

15 MR. DEXTER: I would agree that this hasn't worked,
16 but not because we haven't provided substantive answers for
17 the relevant period, 2006-2008. We're not denying any of the
18 relevant transfers. And in the cases that we are denying the
19 relevant transfers, we will produce those records. There's
20 no reason why the trustee should have all of this
21 unnecessary personal financial information.

22 THE COURT: So you agree it hasn't worked? You just
23 said that. But it's the trustee's fault.

24 MR. DEXTER: The reason why it hasn't worked is
25 because the route has recanted his representations, changed

1 his mind, used tactics that are intentionally designed to
2 deceive, and now when we do provide meaningful answers, the
3 trustee says, "No, they're not good enough, you have seven
4 days to comply with the subpoena."

5 THE COURT: Okay, so you're saying it hasn't worked
6 because of something the trustee did. Is that what you're
7 saying?

8 MR. DEXTER: Of the things that I just listed, yes.

9 THE COURT: If I agree with you that it hasn't
10 worked, but it's because of the quality of the answers that
11 the trustee has been getting, then would you agree that the
12 trustee should not be bothered with serving any further
13 requests for admission?

14 MR. DEXTER: Unless you look at these answers and
15 you say that yes, it's true, from 2006 to 2008,
16 (indiscernible).

17 THE COURT: You're not listening to me. I just
18 said, assume that I conclude that the answers don't advance
19 the case, they don't admit the transfers. Would you then
20 agree that the trustee should be released from this
21 procedure, which he agreed to follow, and not serve any more
22 requests for admission? I mean, I guess he's still free to
23 serve them, but you seem to agree that it hasn't worked.

24 MR. DEXTER: Your question, that's assuming that
25 you think the answers that we have provided are not

1 sufficient.

2 THE COURT: Right, I'm allowed to ask hypothetical
3 questions. So if you assume that, then what's the purpose of
4 going on with this?

5 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, in the federal rule for
6 requests for admissions, there are remedies contained in
7 that rule, and if the trustee is not satisfied with certain
8 answers, he can seek remedies in that rule. That rule
9 doesn't say he could send a subpoena on all the defendants,
10 and get all their personal bank records.

11 THE COURT: All right. Is there anybody else you
12 haven't covered, that you want to cover?

13 MR. DEXTER: Halpern is another one.

14 THE COURT: Let me find Halpern.

15 MR. DEXTER: That's all right.

16 THE COURT: Okay, Halpern there are several
17 accounts, or at least two accounts. For Account Number
18 1S0324, all the withdrawals were denied. And for Account
19 Number 0118 -- I'm talking about the two-year period, now.
20 I'm sorry, which were the accounts that issued them? Let me
21 do this. I don't recall, in the 0118 account, were the
22 withdrawals denied?

23 MS. CHAITMAN: Your Honor, may I be heard on that?

24 THE COURT: If you know the answer to it, yeah.

25 MS. CHAITMAN: I think I do. There are three

Page 36

1 different trusts involved, and there are two trustees: one
2 trustee for one trust, and another trustee for two trusts.
3 The trustee for the respective trusts admitted the
4 transfers. The trustee who was not a trustee for the
5 specific trust lacked knowledge of any of the transfers, and
6 therefore denied them. But the knowledgeable trustee for
7 each trust admitted the transfers for, I don't remember the
8 precise period, but it was at least 10 years, and it
9 certainly encompassed the last two years.

10 THE COURT: I'm doing it by account, corresponding
11 to the accounts that were questioned in the trustee's
12 request for admission. In Account 0118, there was only
13 \$13,266 withdrawn within the two years. There were no
14 deposits. And I think that the trustee admitted those, did
15 he not, or did she not?

16 MS. CHAITMAN: The relevant trustee admitted them,
17 Your Honor. I just don't remember which trust that is. I
18 don't remember the account number.

19 THE COURT: I think after they admitted them into
20 the other two, the withdrawals were denied, that's my
21 recollection. Let's see --

22 MS. CHAITMAN: But that's because there was only
23 one trustee for that trust.

24 THE COURT: They were certainly denied for the 0324
25 account. What about the 0086 account? Let's see. Oh, no, I

1 see that they were denied to the 0866 account. I'm looking
2 at the responses, 15 -- the receipt for the account, the
3 receipt of the transfers for those accounts were denied. All
4 right. That leaves Barbanel.

5 MR. DEXTER: Barbanel has records of deposits from
6 March 1999 on. Barbanel does not have any records of
7 withdrawals. Barbanel is willing to allow the trustee to
8 subpoena bank records to determine transfers to and from
9 Madoff within a relevant time period. And Barbanel has no
10 problem with that.

11 THE COURT: So he has no objection to the subpoena?

12 MR. DEXTER: Only if it's limited solely from
13 transfers to and from Madoff, not in an attempt to obtain
14 the entire universe of bank records.

15 THE COURT: I got it. All right. But he denies all
16 of the transfers which admissions are requested, in the
17 request for admissions?

18 MR. DEXTER: Just the withdrawals, because he
19 doesn't have records of that, so how could he admit.

20 THE COURT: I'm not arguing with you about that,
21 Mr. Dexter, I'm just saying he can't admit it, the trustee's
22 got to get the information somewhere else, right?

23 MR. DEXTER: Right, the trustee should get all the
24 relevant information, and not all entirely irrelevant
25 information.

Page 38

1 THE COURT: Okay, and who decides what's relevant
2 and what's not relevant?

3 MR. DEXTER: Well, I mean, you look at the federal
4 rules. You look at Rule 26, and the Court makes the
5 determination. Is this really the best way to do this? Do we
6 really want to allow the trustee to obtain all of these
7 other records when there are numerous other discovery
8 devices that would allow the same relevant information
9 without the same intrusion?

10 THE COURT: Where else would the trustee get the
11 information regarding the withdrawals in the Barbanel case?
12 Can't ask Mr. Barbanel, because he doesn't know.

13 MR. DEXTER: Well, Mr. Barbanel could produce them,
14 why not?

15 THE COURT: So why didn't he just admit the
16 transfers, then?

17 MR. DEXTER: Because at the time, he didn't have
18 the information. If it was a matter of --

19 THE COURT: So why didn't he amend his answers?

20 MR. DEXTER: It's probably a practical issue when
21 you're dealing with, in some cases, 100 request for
22 admission served against one defendant, there's only so much
23 you can do. So anything that's relevant, Mr. Barbanel is
24 happy to not contest the trustee's subpoena of, and if it
25 would help things, he would do what he can to produce these

Page 39

1 records. At this time, he doesn't have all the records that
2 would be required for him to admit the expansive requests
3 for admissions that the trustee has served on him.

4 THE COURT: All right. I think that covers all of
5 the cases in which subpoenas have been served. If you're
6 done, let me hear from the other side.

7 MR. DEXTER: Just one thing about the affirmative
8 defenses, and let's go back to the Saren-Lawrence case. In
9 that case, the only affirmative defense that's raised is the
10 tax records, affirmative defense. And as has been made clear
11 on the record, that defense on applies for taxes paid before
12 2003. The records sought in the subpoena are records in
13 2007, 2008, and 2009. So any records that would be produced
14 in response to that subpoena would shed no light whatsoever
15 on that affirmative defense.

16 THE COURT: Can I ask you a question, though? Why
17 did she deny receipt of the money that was apparently
18 withdrawn to pay taxes, when she got the refunds? How can
19 she assert that as a defense, if she got a refund for those
20 payments?

21 MR. DEXTER: Well, in that case, the affirmative
22 defense wouldn't apply.

23 THE COURT: But I've had this conversation with
24 Chaitman, I said, "Modify or withdraw the defense." It's
25 still out there.

1 MR. DEXTER: Right, so I mean, that could be one
2 remedy. The Court could say, unless Saren-Lawrence modifies
3 that affirmative defense, then we will order compliance with
4 the subpoena.

5 THE COURT: But I've said that already. I said it
6 two months ago, I think.

7 MR. DEXTER: I mean, I think it's been clear on the
8 record that that affirmative defense only exists prior to
9 2003. But whether it says that in the answer or not --

10 THE COURT: That's what you tell me, the simplest
11 thing to do is just amend the answer.

12 MR. DEXTER: All right.

13 THE COURT: That would be -- that could be a
14 simple remedy to that.

15 MR. DEXTER: Yeah.

16 THE COURT: Let me hear from the trustee. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, I didn't come here today
19 to go through all this. Quite frankly, I think her motion
20 is baseless. There's been a lot of adjectives and adverbs
21 tossed towards the trustee. I've no interest in going
22 through them. I think they are groundless. Ms. Chaitman
23 has no temerity whatsoever in personally attacking anyone
24 she feels like it and gets away with it. So let's leave
25 that as it is.

Page 41

1 On the other hand, there's been a suggestion here
2 that we've done something wrong. If Your Honor wants to go
3 through each and every one of these, that's just not true.
4 And I'll just give one instance. In January 27th, we're
5 sitting here and the so-called representation is made, that
6 somehow becomes an order of Your Honor, that we won't. We
7 won't enforce the subpoena until we give them an opportunity
8 to be heard.

9 The day before, our colleagues at the -- never can
10 think of names --

11 THE COURT: Mr. (indiscernible) office.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: -- yes -- get served a subpoena.

13 Why? That young woman was charged with contempt.

14 Cavalierly, Ms. Chaitman comes to this court and then
15 withdraws it. This isn't TV. You don't make an allegation
16 and say withdrawn and that's it.

17 This is what's going on here. This is what has to
18 stop. We don't agree with anything she has said about us.
19 We've done that nothing wrong. While the press may be who
20 she's playing to, we don't. We come to court. We give you
21 our answers, and I think we've given you the answer to all
22 her objections in our papers.

23 Let's get to the Rule 26 fiasco that she's created
24 here. There's no basis in law for anything that she's
25 saying. To suggest to Your Honor that we can't make any

Page 42

1 discovery with regard to subsequence in the context of
2 initial transferee cases is baseless. There's no case that
3 holds that. She has none.

4 What she's doing is corrupting things. Let's walk
5 through it. In (indiscernible), we have to have a plausible
6 basis. Your Honor's very familiar with that, right? You
7 rule against us. We say okay, how about discovery? What
8 would Your Honor say to that? I'm not going to allow
9 discovery. You don't even have a plausible basis for your
10 complaint. You can't get discovery.

11 That doesn't apply here, yet that's the echo that
12 we hear Ms. Chaitman. Ms. Chaitman seems to think that
13 because in the omnibus case, she got one subsequent
14 dismissed, that therefore that means we get no discovery on
15 subsequents.

16 THE COURT: How can you get discovery? Putting
17 aside the avoidance litigation order, which I have a
18 question about, how do you get discovery in the adversary
19 proceeding into an issue that's not in the case.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, that's where I agree with Your
21 Honor about 2004. But, but I think we get it before a jury
22 and after. All right? We get it before in 2004. We get a
23 jury for this reason. This reason is that who knows better,
24 and what records better reflect who the subsequent
25 transferee is than in that case?

1 And there's nothing in the law that suggests we
2 have two weeks. Colonial Gas doesn't got that far. We
3 don't have to avoid the initial transfer, it would seem to
4 me, in order to wait and get discovery.

5 THE COURT: I agree with you, and I've had that
6 case and Judge Rakoff had the issue where you don't have to
7 -- well, first to void the initial transfer--

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Correct.

9 THE COURT: --to sue the subsequent transferee,
10 but you haven't sued the subsequent transferee.

11 MR. SHEEHAN: And that's the reason why 'cause we
12 don't know 'cause until we have this discovery, we don't
13 find out. In the meantime, what Your Honor's allowing by
14 not letting us use Rule 26 or suggesting that or adopting
15 what Miss -- the records are disappearing. Did -- Congress
16 intended that? I don't think so.

17 When they gave us 550, they didn't say, oh, you
18 have to wait until you get the initial transferee, and that
19 gives all those initials a fast opportunity to destroy
20 records, get rid of them. You'll never find them. I don't
21 think that's what Congress was doing, all right?

22 What Congress gave us under Rule 26 is the ability
23 -- in this certainly germane to find out what they did.
24 Just take the example of the husband and the wife. I was at
25 work at Crummy, Gibbons, and O'Neal, and Andrew B. Crummy

1 told me the first place to look when you're dealing with a
2 fraudster is the wife or the husband.

3 Rule number one.

4 THE COURT: You know what happened in the
5 (indiscernible) case.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, yes, I do.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. SHEEHAN: But the bottom line is, is that
9 where else are you going to look? It's a start, but there's
10 no reason in the world why I shouldn't be able to go there.
11 And, and this business of privacy that keeps popping up.

12 THE COURT: Let's move off the subsequent
13 transferee issue 'cause I don't think that's standing to
14 raise it in the context of the motion (indiscernible).

15 MR. SHEEHAN: I understand that, but I think we
16 need clarity to be able to go forward or you -- Your Honor,
17 you and I will be back here again and again--

18 THE COURT: Well, maybe -- okay.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: --as we were last week on trustee
20 compensation.

21 THE COURT: You're not -- you are not gonna get it
22 today because I don't think they have standing to even raise
23 the issue.

24 MR. SHEEHAN: Okay.

25 THE COURT: So it's an academic discussion at this

Page 45

1 point, and maybe you should just seek a Rule 2004 order,
2 which is designed to get information to come out -- to
3 commence adversary proceedings.

4 MR. SHEEHAN: I will do that without conceding
5 that --

6 THE COURT: All right, far enough.

7 MR. SHEEHAN: -- we can't do it under Rule 26.

8 THE COURT: Well, it's not teed up. It's not teed
9 up today because these are third party banks' appearance.

10 MR. SHEEHAN: Correct, I understand. So in any
11 event, I think -- I am --

12 THE COURT: So let's move on to the privacy
13 issues.

14 MR. DEXTER: The privacy issue, I think, is -- has
15 been vexing the courthouse for years. It isn't new. That's
16 one we have protective orders. We have highly confidential,
17 where only the attorneys can look. We have confidential
18 where our staff and others can look. This has been dealt
19 with for years and years and years, and, you know, the
20 heightened attention to it in this cyber world we live in
21 today seems to give it an added value, which I think
22 overstates the issue.

23 While we're really talking about here is that we
24 get access to this, just as Your Honor order, by the way --
25 you know, it seems like a century ago -- when we were in

Page 46

1 here in Cohmad, and we had the same reaction. And Mr.
2 Badway wanted to filter this stuff and mark it up and redact
3 it and do all kinds of things. And Your Honor quite
4 correctly ordered no. It goes to the trustee. He's
5 operating under a protective order. He is, yeah, a
6 fiduciary. He's whatever. He's an officer of the court.
7 He will abide by that order, and therefore, he gets access
8 to it.

9 The same thing should happen here. There is no
10 privacy issue. There is a privacy issue in the sense that
11 we need to -- not a privacy issue, I should say, that would
12 bar discovery. There's a privacy issue that must be paid
13 attention to, and we have. We've done it the right way, and
14 that should not bar us from going forward and getting all
15 these records so that we can do our job as trustee.

16 Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: All right. I'll give you the last
18 word, Mr. Dexter.

19 MR. DEXTER: If I could, just with respect to
20 Cohmad, that case is really not applicable to this dispute
21 because the movant in that case who was moving to quash the
22 subpoena was actually a defendant and actually was a
23 subsequent transferee in that case. And in that case, the
24 trustee had already satisfied Rule 8 pleading standards. In
25 this case, the Rule 8 pleading standards are not

1 established, so that case does not apply.

2 THE COURT: Well, but my sense was that Mr.

3 Sheehan was mentioning that in terms of how the privacy
4 issue was dealt with.

5 MR. DEXTER: Right, and how the privacy issue was
6 dealt with, and that was an objection that was raised. And
7 I'm not sure that Your Honor on a mostly ruled on the
8 privacy issue. I would --

9 THE COURT: Well, I essentially did by saying un-
10 redacted records would be turned over to the trustee and
11 they'd be held in confidence.

12 MR. DEXTER: Well, if you look at the facts of
13 that case --

14 THE COURT: And I mean, I think I also said that
15 the trustee should give, in that case, Mr. -- who is it
16 Greenberg, or...

17 MS. JENSON: Mr. Greenberg.

18 THE COURT: Mr. Greenberg's attorney the records
19 he got from the bank, and if there was a particular issue
20 regarding what should be redacted, they should discuss it,
21 but I would ultimately decide it rather than have a third
22 party decided.

23 MR. DEXTER: The defendants in that case are not
24 entitled, I would think, to the same level of privacy as in
25 this case. In that case, those are people that were working

1 with Bernard Madoff to commit what they knew was a fraud.

2 In this case, we have --

3 THE COURT: Well, they deny that.

4 MR. DEXTER: In this case, we have people who are
5 entirely innocent investors, were the trustee is seeking all
6 their personal bank records. In that case, you have someone
7 who is a known subsequent transferee, who's a known
8 defendant in the case --

9 THE COURT: You keep -- you know, you keep
10 confusing the subsequent transferee issue with the privacy
11 issue. They're two different issues. And you may have --
12 you certainly have standing to raise the privacy issue. I'm
13 not sure you have standing to raise the subsequent
14 transferee issue.

15 MR. DEXTER: Well, that's something we can
16 certainly brief for the Court, but my --

17 THE COURT: I don't need to brief it. That's
18 before me now. I need

19 MR. DEXTER: But my point -- sorry, Your Honor.
20 Go on.

21 THE COURT: If you didn't brief it at this point,
22 you know, what's further briefing gonna do? That's the
23 issue raised by your motions, or the two issues raised by
24 your motions.

25 MR. DEXTER: Well, we don't -- I don't think

Page 49

1 anyone doubts that the defendants have the standings to
2 raise these issues, at least with respect to the
3 confidentiality. The question becomes do they have a
4 standing to advance what is a clearly established principle
5 of law--

6 THE COURT: Which, which principle is that?

7 MR. DEXTER: It's the one that's been repeated ad
8 nauseam here. It's that you cannot use discovery to frame a
9 complaint against subsequent transferees.

10 THE COURT: Got it. I think have a question for
11 Mr. Sheehan.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: I noticed that you did not respond to
14 the aspect of the motion to dismiss the cases.

15 MR. SHEEHAN: I think it's groundless.

16 THE COURT: (indiscernible)

17 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, I did -- I do now.

18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can sit
19 down. The defendants in 11 adversary proceedings
20 representative Chaitman, LLP, hereinafter Chaitman, have
21 moved among other things to dismiss the adversary
22 proceedings based on alleged violations of representations
23 made to the Court by the trustee that he would not seek to
24 compel compliance with a certain bank of subpoenas until 30
25 days after the trustee served request for admissions on the

1 defendants or proposed stipulations of fact. For the
2 reasons that follow, the motions to dismiss are denied.

3 The defendants are good faith transferees of
4 alleged fictitious profits. The trustee commenced adversary
5 proceedings against the defendants to recover the fictitious
6 profits up to the amounts transferred within two years of
7 the December 11, 2008, filing date.

8 The trustee served subpoenas on the defendants'
9 banks seeking disclosure of information relating to deposits
10 and withdrawals during the three-year period beginning two
11 years before the filing date and ending on December 31,
12 2009. The current dispute arises from the trustee's efforts
13 to enforce the bank subpoenas.

14 By chambers conference on January 27, 2016, the
15 trustee's attorney represented that while he had and would
16 serve subpoenas because of concerns about spoliation of
17 evidence, which had apparently occurred in one case, he
18 would not seek to enforce the subpoenas until 30 days after
19 he served either a proposed stipulation of facts or request
20 for admissions relating to the transfers at issue in the
21 adversary proceeding. If the defendant admitted the
22 transfers, he would forgo enforcing the subpoena except to
23 the extent that the bank records were also relevant to an
24 affirmative defense asserted by the defendant.

25 The trustee's concession and certain actions

Page 51

1 attributed to Chaitman generated additional letter writing
2 to the Court and more litigation. The trustee accused
3 Chaitman of contacting at least one bank to advise it not to
4 comply with the subpoena.

5 Chaitman in turn move to told one of the trustee's
6 attorneys in contempt for serving a subpoena the day before
7 the chambers conference. Chaitman also accused the trustee
8 of misrepresenting that he had served request for admission
9 in adversary proceedings in which he had served subpoenas.

10 As a result, the Court held a conference on the
11 record on February 11th, 2016. The Court reiterated the
12 prohibition against contacting the subpoenaed banks directly
13 and instant directed the parties to first meet and confer
14 and if necessary, raise any issues with the Court.

15 The Court further stated on the record that the
16 trustee was free to enforce the subpoenas in the absence if
17 a protective order "transcript of February 11, 2016, hearing
18 at 13", and if necessary, move to compel the compliance Id.
19 at 14.

20 Finally, the Court confirmed the trustee's
21 commitment that he would not seek to enforce any bank
22 subpoenas until 30 days after he delivered a proposed
23 stipulation of facts or requests for admission, Id. at 14 to
24 15.

25 On or about February 18th, the trustee wrote to

Page 52

1 several of the banks regarding the subpoenas previously
2 served in the Alpern, Barbanel, Roth, Shapiro, and Saren-
3 Lawrence cases. Each letter referred to the Court's
4 direction that the trustee could enforce the subpoena absent
5 a protective order and demand compliance by February 25.
6 See declaration of Helen Davis Chaitman dated February 26,
7 2016, Exhibit 3.

8 As of February 18, 2016, and with one exception,
9 the defendant's time to respond to previously served
10 requests for admission had not expired, and in fact, no
11 request for admission had been served in the four Shapiro
12 cases. The one exception I mention was Saren-Lawrence, who
13 had served her initial responses to trustee's request for
14 admissions in December and had served amended responses on
15 February 3rd.

16 Furthermore, the trustee had not served any -- as
17 I mentioned, any requests for admission in the four
18 adversary proceedings relating to Shapiro, who is deceased,
19 although he served thank subpoenas in those cases and
20 insisted on compliance.

21 On February 26th, Chaitman moved, pursuant to
22 rules and 37(d) and 41(b) of the federal rules of civil
23 procedure, to dismiss the cases. She argued that the
24 trustee had violated his own representations to the Court
25 and the Court's order of the February 11th hearing that he

1 should -- that he would not insist on compliance with the
2 bank subpoenas before the defendants in the adversary
3 proceedings had the opportunity to either admit the facts
4 relating to the deposits and transfers in response to
5 requests for admissions.

6 The defendant's motions to dismiss suffer from
7 several fatal defects. Rule 37(d) authorizes a Court to
8 impose sanctions against a party for its failure to comply
9 with an order compelling discovery. Rules 41(b) authorize a
10 court to dismiss an action for failure to comply with a
11 court order. Dismissal under Rule 41(b) is a drastic remedy
12 that is committed to the Court's discretion (indiscernible)
13 federal practice section 41.5[3] and [4] (3rd edition 2014).

14 Chaitman has not identified a court order that the
15 trustee supposedly violated. The theory is that he violated
16 a representation, to wit that he would not enforce a
17 subpoena until 30 days after he served a proposed
18 stipulation of facts or request for admissions.

19 The defendants have not cited any authority
20 supporting a dismissal for violating representation, and if
21 the trustee have done so, the Court would follow the less
22 drastic approach of quashing the subpoena if it was
23 appropriate.

24 Next, the Romans and Wilentz have not produced
25 letters demanding compliance with the subpoenas in these

1 cases -- in both cases. Hence they fail to identify any
2 conduct that allegedly violated the direction of the Court.
3 In addition, as I mentioned, the defendant in Saren-Lawrence
4 served her amended responses on February 3rd, so any
5 prohibition or agreement regarding a stay of enforcement of
6 the subpoena had expired by February 18th.

7 In any case, the trustees insistence on compliance
8 with the bank subpoenas did not violate the Court's order
9 were justify a refusal of -- a dismissal of the adversary
10 proceedings. At the February 11th hearing, the Court stated
11 that the banks were required to comply with the subpoenas,
12 to which they did not object on their own account absent a
13 protective order.

14 Hence the trustee was free to demand compliance,
15 and it was incumbent upon the defendants to move for a
16 protective order and/or to quash the subpoenas.

17 Nevertheless, the Court's statement on February 11th
18 appeared to be inconsistent with the trustee's
19 representation that he would not seek to enforce the
20 subpoenas until 30 days after he served a request for
21 admissions or after he received unsatisfactory responses.

22 Except for the Saren-Lawrence case, the
23 defendant's time to respond had not expired when the trustee
24 wrote his February 18th, 2016, letters demanding compliance
25 by the banks. The Court's statement at the February 11th

1 conference that the banks must comply with the subpoenas
2 absent a protective order was not intended to relieve the
3 trustee of the representation he had made to the Court.

4 Furthermore, it was not intended to relieve the
5 parties of the requirements memorialized in the order signed
6 on February 19th to meet and confer, seek a court conference
7 if they would not agree, refrain from contacting the banks
8 until any -- or refrain from contacting the banks until any
9 disputes were resolved. In addition if a conference was
10 requested, the Court -- the order stayed dispute of
11 discovery pending a resolution of dispute.

12 Given the confusion, sanctions against the trustee
13 are not appropriate. The defendants in Saren-Lawrence
14 Barbanel, Roman and Wilentz have served their responses, and
15 the trustee is not insisting on compliance pending the
16 disposition of the motions to quash what -- a protective
17 court order or a protective order.

18 Roth has not responded to the request for
19 admissions, and Chaitman is seeking to withdraw her --
20 withdraws her counsel. The trustee has explained it wants
21 time to respond, although he has now was drawn the request
22 for admissions. And as I mentioned, he hasn't even served
23 the request for admissions in the four Shapiro cases.

24 The Court we'll address have the various the
25 subpoenas to the extent it hasn't done, so in connection

1 with the motions to quash, but will not dismiss the cases.
2 The defendants have moved to quash the bank subpoenas and
3 Mr. Lawrence has moved for protective order and to quash the
4 subpoena. The trustee has agreed to await the determination
5 of the Court before seeking any further steps to compel
6 compliance with the bank subpoenas, and that is sufficient.
7 Accordingly, the motions to dismiss, pursuant to Rule 37(b)
8 and Rule 41(d) are denied.

9 Prior to turning to the specific subpoenas, the
10 Court will first address certain general issues that apply
11 to all or mostly all of the motions to quash and/or further
12 protective order.

13 First, the motions to quash are not untimely or
14 alternatively, the defendants have good cause -- have shown
15 good cause for not moving sooner. The parties were required
16 to meet and confer and then seek a conference with the
17 Court, before filing formal discovery motions. Strict
18 adherence to the timing requirements advocated by the
19 trustee would eviscerate the remedial purposes of the meet
20 and confer requirements. The Court conducted several
21 conferences and it was only at the February 11th hearing
22 that it authorized the trustee to seek compliance with the
23 subpoenas in the absence of a protective order.

24 One week later, by letters dated February 18th,
25 the trustee insisted on compliance in many of the cases by

Page 57

1 February 25th, only one week after the letter. His letters
2 dictated the timing of the motions and the defendants filed
3 a motion to quash the subpoenaed and for protective on
4 February 26th.

5 Second, the defendants cannot quash the subpoenas
6 on the basis that the bank disclosures might (indiscernible)
7 subsequent transfer (indiscernible) information. They argue
8 that the information is irrelevant, either because the
9 complaint did not assert a subsequent transfer claim, or if
10 they did, the claim was dismissed.

11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(3) sets
12 forth the grounds to quash or modify a subpoena. It states,
13 in relevant part, that the Court must quash or modify
14 subpoena that, open quote, "requires disclosure of
15 privileged or other protected matter," period, end quote.
16 Open quote, "In the absence of a claim of privilege, a party
17 usually does not have standing to object to a subpoena
18 directed to a non-party witness," period, end quote.
19 *Langford versus Chrysler Motors Corporation*, 513 F.2d 1121,
20 1126, Second Circuit, 1975.

21 Accordingly, a party lacks standing to challenge
22 subpoenas issued to non-parties on grounds of relevancy or
23 undue burden. *Universitas Education, LLC versus Nova Group,*
24 Inc., 2013 Westlaw 57892, 5, (SDNY January 4th, 2013)
25 (collecting cases). The defendants, therefore, lack

1 standing to quash subpoenas because the bank records
2 contained irrelevant -- on the theory that the bank records
3 contained irrelevant subsequent transfer information.

4 Moreover, the defendants have put subsequent
5 transfers into issue through their affirmative defenses.
6 Every defendant asserted that he or she was entitled to a
7 (indiscernible) or equitable adjustment to the extent he or
8 she paid taxes on fictitious profits. Judging from the
9 responses to the requests for admissions, several of the
10 defendants paid the taxes from the same accounts in which
11 they deposited their withdrawals from BLMIS.

12 The defendants contend that they are no longer
13 asserting this defense for any period after 2003, because
14 the government granted them relief, and refunded the part of
15 the tax payments attributable to the fictitious profits.
16 However, the defendants have not modified or withdrawn this
17 defense, despite the Court's admonition to do so.

18 More generally, every defendant, except for Saren-
19 Lawrence has asserted the defense that open quote, "there
20 can be no liability of any recipient of funds, who, as a
21 matter of law or contract was required to transfer any
22 portion of the fund to a third party," closed quote. This
23 defense implies that these defendants intend to argue that
24 they lack dominion and control of some of the BLMIS
25 withdrawals that they subsequently transferred.

1 Third, the defendants have standing to object to
2 the third party subpoenas on privacy grounds, but bear the
3 burden of persuasion as to the parties seeking to quash the
4 subpoenas. Concord Boat Corporation versus Brunswick, 169
5 FRD 44, 48, (SDNY, 1996). While Courts have recognized that
6 an individual has a privacy interest in his personal
7 financial information, In Re: Glitnir, G-L-I-T-N-I-R, Bank
8 2011 Westlaw 3652764, 5 (Bankruptcy, SDNY, August 19, 2011)
9 (collecting cases), the right to privacy is not absolute,
10 open quote, "When a subpoena seeks the production of an
11 individual's personal financial information, the Court must
12 balance the relevance of the information sought against the
13 intrusion into the affected individual's privacy interest,"
14 period, closed quote, id.

15 Unlike the portion of the administrative subpoena
16 quashed in McWane versus FDIC. F.3d, 1127, (Second Circuit
17 1995), a case cited by the defendants, the trustee is
18 seeking the defendants own relevant personal financial
19 information. McWane upheld the subpoenas to that extent.

20 The bank information is plainly relevant because
21 the trustee is seeking to recover transfers from BLMIS to
22 the defendants and the defendants presumably deposited the
23 transfers into their bank accounts. Furthermore, the
24 information is not duplicative of the trustee's records,
25 because the defendants have challenged the accuracy of the

Page 60

1 trustee's records. If the defendants don't believe the
2 BLMIS records are accurate, I may not either. In that case
3 the trustee may have to prove his case, through the
4 defendants' bank records.

5 Even if the defendant does not dispute the
6 accuracy of the BLMIS records, the defendants' refusal to
7 admit the transfers makes them a disputed fact the trustee
8 must prove through other evidence. The trustee is entitled
9 to the bank information to prove the fact that the transfers
10 will meet the affirmative defenses.

11 The counterbalance against the relevancy of the
12 records is the defendants' general assertion of a right to
13 privacy in their financial records but nothing more. Given
14 the importance of the bank records to the trustee's
15 fraudulent transfer claims, and the defendants' denial of
16 some or all of those transfers, they have failed to sustain
17 their burden to show that their general privacy concerns
18 outweigh the relevance of the bank information. Moreover,
19 the trustee has agreed to treat the bank information as
20 confidential thus preventing their disclosure to the world
21 at large.

22 This conclusion also applies to the request for a
23 protective order filed by James Lawrence, the spouse of the
24 defendant Helene Saren-Lawrence. The trustee did not
25 subpoena Mr. Lawrence's bank records, rather, he subpoenaed

1 his wife's bank records at Valley National Bank, and Mr.
2 Lawrence and his wife are the joint owners of the account,
3 by their own choice. Mr. Lawrence admits that his wife's
4 Madoff-related transfers, including the tax refunds relating
5 to liabilities she still seeks to offset, were deposited
6 into the joint account, declaration of James Lawrence, in
7 support of motion for a protective order, dated February 22,
8 2016 at Paragraph 3.

9 The defendant has not admitted to any of the
10 transfers from Madoff. Her responses to the request for
11 admissions only admit to the transfers to the extent they
12 are consistent with the records subpoenaed from her
13 accountant. This requires the trustee to prove the
14 transfers through the accountant's records, which
15 contravenes the very purpose of request for admission, and
16 is effectively a denial of the transfers.

17 Furthermore, Valley National's production of
18 records redacted only to show what it says -- what it
19 contends are only the Madoff-related transfers and
20 withdrawals, see id., is no substitute for an unredacted
21 production. Redactions breed suspicion and may deprive the
22 reader of context, In Re: State Street Bank and Trust
23 Company, Fixed Income Funds Investments Litigation, 2009,
24 Westlaw 1026013, 1 (SDNY April 8, 2009). They are only
25 permissible to protect privileged, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

1 versus Book Dog Books, LLC, 298 FRD 184, 186 (SDNY 2014),
2 and the Court has concluded that the relevance of the
3 records outweighs any general privacy concerns.

4 The defendant's suggestion that they or a third
5 party redacted documents is therefore unacceptable.

6 Moreover, if the defendants are willing to show the records
7 to show the records to a neutral third party, there is no
8 reason why they shouldn't show them to the trustee who will
9 hold them in confidence. If the defendants seek the
10 redaction of specific records turned over to the trustee,
11 the defendant can raise any redaction request based upon
12 privacy concerns directly with the Court.

13 Now with respect to the specific subpoenas, I've
14 already dealt with the subpoenas in Saren-Lawrence. As I've
15 suggested, the admission to the transfers to the extent
16 they're consistent with Ms. Saren-Lawrence's accountant's
17 records is just not an admission at all, and as I said would
18 require the trustee, essentially, to put the accountant on
19 the stand, ask him about the records to prove the transfers.
20 That doesn't accomplish the purpose that the transfers were
21 intended to accomplish and for that reason, whatever the
22 trustee's representations were about holding off compliance,
23 the responses don't admit the transfers, so the trustee is
24 free to compel compliance with the subpoenas.

25 With respect to the Romans, in both cases I note

1 that they denied transfers of \$150,000 and \$125,000, they
2 denied receipt of those transfers, they didn't simply deny
3 the transfers. So they put those transfers in issue.
4 They've also stated that they did not receive credit for
5 \$140,000 worth of deposits that they made so those deposits
6 are also at issue because they would obviously affect the
7 trustee's computation of fictitious profits and the amount
8 that he could ultimately recover.

9 In addition, like all the other defendants, except
10 for Saren-Lawrence, that have raised this affirmative
11 defense, that somehow money they got from BLMIS, that they
12 were required to transfer by contract or other -- or by law,
13 was not itself a receipt of money, puts the subsequent
14 transfers in issue.

15 With respect to Halpern, I noted that two of the
16 three accounts, all of the transfers were denied, but I
17 thought for one of the accounts all of the transfers were
18 admitted.

19 MAN: We don't know.

20 THE COURT: Well you're seeking to enforce
21 compliance with these subpoenas. It's the -- I think it's
22 Account 324. Or I'm sorry, one of them is -- no, no, no, I
23 take that back. I see an answer to Question Number 76 that
24 the receipt of \$43,096 was denied. And also in response to
25 Request Number 81, the receipt of \$63,259 was denied. Also,

1 the return of a check was denied.

2 Which of the Halpern -- were there any of the
3 Halpern accounts where the transfers were admitted, Mr.
4 Dexter?

5 MR. DEXTER: Yes, the Halpern's admitted --

6 THE COURT: Which one?

7 MR. DEXTER: -- -- had a request for admission 78,
8 79, 82 --

9 THE COURT: Let me see. 78, 79? Which account is
10 that?

11 MR. DEXTER: I'm not sure which account that is.

12 THE COURT: Let me just see. It's Account 324,
13 but they denied several of the receipts and they denied the
14 receipt of the -- or the returned check.

15 So -- and they've also asserted that defense that
16 I mentioned about receiving money as a conduit or in trust
17 on some theory that it doesn't count as a receipt. So I'll
18 compel compliance with those subpoenas.

19 What about Barbanel? I thought I said Barbanel
20 had denied all the receipts and I think you told me he
21 didn't have any other records? Is that -- is he the one?

22 MR. DEXTER: On the withdrawals, correct?

23 THE COURT: Oh, he was -- okay. So I'll compel
24 compliance with those subpoenas.

25 Now with Wilentz, and I know he has this

Page 65

1 affirmative defense, like everybody else, but he's admitted
2 the receipt of the money and there were no deposits during
3 the two-year period. So why do you need his or its bank
4 records? There are two accounts, I think. One received
5 \$130,000, one received \$150,000 and he's admitted that.

6 MS. JENSON: Your Honor, these are the responses
7 where the defendant is also challenging the accuracy of the
8 BLMIS bank records.

9 THE COURT: But you only -- I know. And that goes
10 back to whenever the account was opened. But you're only
11 asking about that two or three-year period.

12 MS. JENSON: Right.

13 THE COURT: And he's admitted that.

14 MS. JENSON: And --

15 THE COURT: And there's nothing that the bank will
16 produce, in response to the subpoenas that's relevant to the
17 -- these other transfers, which go to computing the
18 fictitious profits.

19 MS. JENSON: Your Honor, if I may propose a
20 solution to this. We learned, during preparing for the
21 argument, that in their claim submission to the trustee, the
22 Wilentz defendants stated that they have all of their bank
23 records going back to the relevant time period, and they
24 match the BLMIS records. And so we would be satisfied with
25 the production of the defendant's records.

1 THE COURT: Is that acceptable, Mr. Dexter?

2 MR. DEXTER: I'm not sure I understand that
3 solution. Satisfied with --

4 THE COURT: In other words, they're going to
5 withdraw the subpoena to the bank on the condition that the
6 defendant produce all his bank records. Because they
7 understand that he has all the bank records going back, I
8 guess, to the beginning of the account?

9 MS. JENSON: That's what she states in her claim
10 submission.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well we have no problems reducing
12 whatever she has. I'm not familiar with that claim
13 submission, so I can't --

14 THE COURT: Why don't we hold that one in
15 abeyance. I won't compel compliance for this -- at this
16 point. We can adjourn it for 30 days, if you want, to see
17 if you get the bank records. And I -- but from what you're
18 telling me is if you get all the bank records from -- is it
19 a him or a her?

20 MS. JENSON: It's a her.

21 THE COURT: A her. If you get all the bank
22 records from her, then you don't need to go forward with the
23 -- to get the same bank records from the bank.

24 MS. JENSON: Obviously she has a more complete set
25 than the bank might.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And these are going to be
2 unredacted records that are going to be produced.

3 MS. JENSON: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Let's just bear that one in mind and
5 we'll hold that one aside.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Now with respect to Shapiro -- let me
8 deal with Roth first. You told me you're withdrawing your
9 request for admissions in Roth and you're not going to serve
10 request for admission in Shapiro. There may be other
11 problems that delay the Shapiro case, I don't know, from
12 going forward. And so that in essence you're saying
13 whatever you represented in the past that hasn't worked for
14 the reasons we've discussed, and on a going forward basis,
15 you're not going to waste time or money sending requests for
16 admissions because we'll be back in court fighting over that
17 objection.

18 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor, with one footnote.
19 Got to have one. Is that in both instances, Roth and
20 Shapiro, new counsel are coming on board. All right? New
21 counsel who -- one is -- I know we've worked with before.

22 THE COURT: Well do you want to adjourn those?

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah, I would like to actually
24 adjourn those until new counsel is on board --

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. SHEEHAN: -- and then we --

2 THE COURT: And then --

3 MR. SHEEHAN: -- can perhaps resolve it with
4 counsel and then inform Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Who's the new counsel in Roth?

6 MR. SHEEHAN: It's -- I don't know Roth, but --

7 MS. JENSON: I'm sorry --

8 MR. SHEEHAN: -- I think in Shapiro -- do we know?

9 MS. JENSON: We don't have counsel on Roth. We
10 actually received a phone call from the defendant, Roth,
11 yesterday. She is expecting -- she is under the impression
12 that the motion to withdraw has already been granted.
13 That's on your docket for today. And we will call her back
14 after that motion to withdraw is granted.

15 THE COURT: Well if it's -- my question is, if
16 it's granted, and I don't have a problem with granting it, I
17 didn't want to do it before today and affect the timing of
18 the resolution of all these issues.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Right.

20 THE COURT: But if it's granted, what do you
21 propose to do with respect to the subpoena in the Roth case?

22 MR. SHEEHAN: Is to talk to the new counsel and
23 see what we could work out there.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. SHEEHAN: And if we could work something out,

Page 69

1 then as we have, as I said earlier, with many other counsel,
2 we may or may not need to subpoena. And the same thing may
3 be true with Shapiro.

4 THE COURT: All right. Do you have any objection
5 then to adjourning the issue of compliance in Wilentz, the
6 four Shapiro cases and Roth for 30 days to see if this can
7 be worked out?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: No problem, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Provided that the banks are on
10 notice to maintain records, so just -- it's being adjourned
11 and you can provide for that.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: And then I'll grant -- Ms. Chaitman,
14 I'll grant your motion on that basis to withdraw in Roth.
15 And you can submit an order to that effect. Okay? I guess
16 she's gone.

17 Mr. Dexter, you can submit an order for your firm
18 withdrawing in Roth. I'll grant that motion.

19 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. Then with respect to the
21 Roman cases, Barbanel, Halpern and Saren-Lawrence, I'm
22 granting -- I'm denying the motions to quash the subpoenas
23 and the motions for a protective order and directing
24 compliance, subject to the requirement that the documents
25 produced by the banks be held in confidence pursuant to the

Page 70

1 -- I think it's the litigation protective order of June 6th,
2 2011. All right?

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: With respect to the -- well, let's say
5 that with respect to the motions in Roth, Shapiro and
6 Wilentz, they'll be adjourned for a period of 30 days and
7 we'll use that as a reporting date. When is the other date
8 in late April when you're supposed to come back?

9 THE CLERK: 25th.

10 THE COURT: the 25th?

11 MAN: 27th.

12 THE COURT: 22nd?

13 MR. SHEEHAN: 27th, Your Honor, I believe.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Why don't we adjourn
15 those motions to that date, for conference purposes, advise
16 the banks they're to hold on to their records, because --

17 MR. SHEEHAN: We will do that. And
18 (indiscernible) --

19 THE COURT: -- the matters are not resolved.

20 MR. SHEEHAN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? Oh, we have
22 the Madoff deposition.

23 MS. JENSON: And I'm sorry, just so the record's
24 clear, the motion to compel Valley National Bank to produce
25 I --

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 MS. JENSON: -- understand that to be granted?

3 THE COURT: Yes. And the motions to dismiss are
4 denied.

5 MS. JENSON: Thank you.

6 MR. GLICKMAN: Your Honor, may I?

7 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

8 MR. GLICKMAN: Barry Glickman on behalf of Valley
9 National Bank. Just one question in the context of the
10 compliance. I understand that there is a protective order
11 in place. Should we mark these documents as produced
12 consistent with that confidentiality order?

13 MR. SHEEHAN: That would be fine, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. And if you --

15 MR. GLICKMAN: Sure.

16 THE COURT: -- can't work it out, then you can
17 come back.

18 MR. GLICKMAN: And is there a time frame on that?

19 THE COURT: Well, you -- how long is it going to
20 take you to produce the record?

21 MR. GLICKMAN: If we could ten days, I'd
22 appreciate that.

23 MR. SHEEHAN: Done.

24 THE COURT: It's been going on for eight years --
25 six years, really. All right.

1 MR. GLICKMAN: We can six months?

2 THE COURT: No.

3 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you, Judge.

4 MS. JENSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. Now --

6 MR. DEXTER: Your Honor, one thing, if I may --

7 THE COURT: Sure.

8 MR. DEXTER: -- before we proceed to the next
9 motion? As you did in Cohmad, will you grant leave to
10 appeal this?

11 THE COURT: Well I can't grant leave to appeal,
12 only the District Court can grant leave to appeal.

13 MR. DEXTER: Will you allow a stay so we can seek
14 (indiscernible)?

15 THE COURT: I'll grant you a 14-day stay.

16 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: And apprise Mr. Glickman.

18 MR. GLICKMAN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: I'll grant you a 14-day stay, you can
20 put that in the order. Not a stay on the dismissed -- on
21 the motion to dismiss. Let Mr. Glickman know --

22 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: -- he'll send you a copy of the order.

24 MR. SHEEHAN: But tell him he's got 14 days.

25 THE COURT: Pardon?

Page 73

1 MR. SHEEHAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I said --

2 THE COURT: Get me the order today, it'll be the
3 14 days from the date of the entry of order of stay, then it
4 is up to the District Court if it wants to entertain the
5 matter.

6 MR. SHEEHAN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: How is the Cohmad matter settled? Is
8 the Cohmad matter still pending?

9 MR. SHEEHAN: Yeah, well what happened was is that
10 there was an attempt to appeal by Mr. Badway and we resolved
11 and it we turned over the bank records in compliance with
12 Your Honor's order.

13 THE COURT: Oh, all right. Okay. Could I have
14 the Madoff deposition (indiscernible).

15 All right. The last matter I have on the calendar
16 is the motion to conduct the deposition of Mr. Madoff with
17 respect to the profit withdrawal issue.

18 MR. DEXTER: Yes, Your Honor. This is the
19 customers' motion. As we've laid it out in our briefs,
20 under the trustee shall conduct examinations by deposition
21 or otherwise, of the debtor, for some reason that has not
22 occurred in this case.

23 THE COURT: And maybe the trustees has made the
24 determination he's not going to believe what he says?

25 MR. DEXTER: It seems that the trustee has made a

1 lot of determinations by himself. This Court has
2 acknowledged that Mr. Madoff would be the most authoritative
3 source of information.

4 THE COURT: I never said that. I never said that.
5 I said that I thought that there must be people who worked
6 for Madoff, and made these entries, that would know what
7 they meant. You really think Mr. Madoff made these entries?

8 MR. DEXTER: He would certainly be a good
9 individual to ask, as to who would have information about
10 them.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. DEXTER: Do I think Mr. Madoff would have
13 information about these entries? Probably. There's one way
14 to find out, and that's to have a deposition conducted.

15 THE COURT: One of the concerns, and this may be
16 the only concern, I don't know, is that the deposition will
17 not be limited to the profit withdrawal issue. And
18 specifically, we could get into the issue of Mr. Picower.
19 And the reason why -- the reason for that is in the
20 declaration put in in the Aaron Blecker matter there was a
21 paragraph relating to Mr. Picower that had nothing to do
22 with Mr. Blecker's particular dispute. So how do we prevent
23 that, if Mr. Madoff is deposed?

24 MR. DEXTER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. So you're
25 acknowledging that you're going to proceed with granting

1 leave to depose --

2 THE COURT: I'm asking you a question. I'm asking
3 you another hypothetical question. If I agree that you
4 should be entitled to take the deposition, what's to prevent
5 you from asking or eliciting information relating, not only
6 to Picower, but to other matters affecting cases in which
7 the parties won't be present at the deposition?

8 MR. DEXTER: Well all you have to do is limit --
9 is enter an order limiting testimony to that scope. And the
10 customers have no intent, whatsoever, to seek any
11 information related to Mr. Picower. The fact that there was
12 information about him on the same declaration is just sort
13 of a practical matter, when you're dealing with someone
14 who's in jail and you can only get one declaration, that's
15 totally overblown and quite frankly irrelevant. Because --

16 THE COURT: Well it was irrelevant when you put it
17 into the Blecker --

18 MR. DEXTER: Well that --

19 THE COURT: -- you interjected it in the Blecker
20 matter. Why'd you do that?

21 MR. DEXTER: It's just that there's one
22 declaration.

23 THE COURT: But the --

24 MR. DEXTER: Mr. Madoff has signed one
25 declaration. It happens to have things in it that aren't

1 necessarily related to this motion.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. DEXTER: You know, it's not -- there's nothing
4 to make of that, at all.

5 THE COURT: You think not?

6 MR. DEXTER: I don't think so.

7 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from the other
8 side.

9 MS. BROWN: Good morning, Your Honor. Seanna
10 Brown on behalf of the trustee.

11 Your Honor, let me start with the second issue
12 about whether or not the deposition should be limited. I
13 just want to follow up on one thing that counsel just said,
14 which is they have no intention of asking any questions
15 regarding the Picower Parties.

16 And Judge Cottle has ruled that Ms. Chaitman is
17 not entitled to that relief, she should not be using this
18 proceeding as an end run around that order. And if they
19 have no intention of asking any questions about that, they
20 should consent to the relief that the trustee and the
21 Picower Parties are seeking --

22 THE COURT: Any objection?

23 MS. BROWN: -- in the limiting order.

24 THE COURT: Any objection to the limiting language
25 in the -- that they propose?

Page 77

1 MR. DEXTER: Where is that language? I would need
2 to review that language specifically. We have no objections
3 to generally limiting the scope. I'd have to look at the
4 specific language.

5 MS. BROWN: I can provide a summary of what --

6 THE COURT: Go ahead.

7 MS. BROWN: -- relief we sought. The first one is
8 that Madoff cannot give testimony about the Picower Parties.
9 The second point is that Ms. Chaitman cannot question him on
10 the Picower Parties. The third point is that the transcript
11 cannot be used in any way until appropriate redactions are
12 made to the extent improper questions are posed, or
13 testimony is given. And the fourth is that the transcript
14 can only be used in the context of the profit withdrawal
15 proceeding, and not against the Picower Parties or in any
16 other matter in which Ms. Chaitman -- or any other matter.

17 THE COURT: Any objection to those conditions?

18 MR. DEXTER: This should really be something for
19 Ms. Chaitman to address --

20 THE COURT: Well, no, no.

21 MR. DEXTER: -- if she's on the line.

22 THE COURT: This has been -- Ms. Chaitman are you
23 on the line? Gone. She's in Barcelona.

24 You know, this issue was coming up today and my
25 sense in the reply brief was that the conditions were

1 agreeable.

2 MR. DEXTER: The conditions are agreeable, that
3 are consistent with that -- what is proposed. What I would
4 propose is that if Your Honor is inclined to grant leave to
5 depose Bernard Madoff, customers' consent to limits --
6 limitations on the scope consistent with the spirit of
7 what's been proposed. And then we could have a few days to
8 just sort of iron that out.

9 THE COURT: Iron what out? Any order that I enter
10 would have those limitations in it.

11 MR. DEXTER: Well in that case, there -- our
12 objection would be futile and --

13 THE COURT: (indiscernible) --

14 MR. DEXTER: -- we'll allow you to enter that
15 order.

16 THE COURT: But I want to resolve this before I
17 enter the order, if I do enter the order. If it can't be
18 resolved, I won't enter the order.

19 Look at the conclusion in the trustee's objection,
20 which sets forth five conditions which I think are the same
21 five conditions of the Picower Parties' requests?

22 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I think there may be a few
23 additional ones in the Picower Parties, so --

24 THE COURT: Well maybe we ought to turn to the
25 Picower Parties, we'll see.

Page 79

1 MR. DEXTER: This is in the Picower Pretty arties'
2 response?

3 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

4 MR. DEXTER: Yeah, now I'm looking at. Okay.

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: It's on Page 11 of the
6 Picower --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: -- Parties' response.

9 THE COURT: There seem to be seven conditions
10 instead of five. It's a little more specific about
11 inquiries about Picower.

12 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: That's right. They're the
13 same ones that the trustee's counsel just --

14 THE COURT: Well --

15 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: -- identified. And then in
16 addition, we want to make sure that we -- that the Picower
17 counsel has the opportunity to review a transcript that's
18 been marked confidential, to make sure that there has been
19 compliance before any use of the deposition -- of the
20 transcript can be made.

21 And we want to make sure that neither the Chaitman
22 parties nor any parties ever can use the transcript in any
23 action to be brought against the Picower Parties or their
24 agencies.

25 And finally --

Page 80

1 THE COURT: Are you proposing the transcript first
2 be filed under seal and then parties -- particularly the
3 Picower Parties, because it's really their issue, although I
4 suppose --

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I think it's the trustee's --

6 THE COURT: -- although I suppose questions could
7 be asked about a lot of cases --

8 MS. BROWN: Yes.

9 THE COURT: -- and counsel for those parties would
10 not be present. Oh, before I forget. I think that there's
11 one other law firm involved in profit withdrawal issue.

12 MS. BROWN: There is. Your Honor, it's --

13 THE COURT: Mr. Kirby?

14 MS. BROWN: -- it's Baker and McKenzie, Richard
15 Kirby.

16 THE COURT: So he would be entitled, since you
17 would presume -- or somebody might use that transcript
18 against his clients, wouldn't he be entitled to participate
19 in this --

20 MS. BROWN: We have no objection to --

21 THE COURT: -- or at least invited?

22 MS. BROWN: -- Mr. Kirby attending the deposition,
23 seeing as he is participating in the profit withdrawal
24 proceeding.

25 THE COURT: All right. Subject to the same

1 limitations.

2 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. The Court -- let's keep
4 that one in mind.

5 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: And then Your Honor, we also
6 want part of the limiting order, if there is one, to direct
7 that any violations of the limiting order would result in
8 sanctions, because --

9 THE COURT: That's self-evident, but it could be
10 in the order.

11 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Okay.

12 THE COURT: Now do you propose to take this
13 deposition by telephone? It seems to me it's going to be a
14 short deposition.

15 MR. DEXTER: No, we'd like to take it in North
16 Carolina at the penitentiary.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I still do want to be
19 heard on why the deposition shouldn't go forward at all.

20 THE COURT: Go ahead. Go ahead.

21 MS. BROWN: We don't feel that the deposition
22 should be permitted because Madoff's declaration revealed
23 that he doesn't have personal knowledge about the profit
24 withdrawal transactions.

25 THE COURT: So then it will be even a short

1 deposition.

2 MS. BROWN: True. But we don't think that he's
3 shown that he has a -- personal knowledge about these
4 issues. So we don't think his deposition should be
5 permitted.

6 THE COURT: But how do you know unless you ask
7 him?

8 MS. BROWN: I think his declaration --

9 THE COURT: In other words --

10 MS. BROWN: -- is reveal --

11 THE COURT: -- if this weren't Madoff and he
12 wasn't in prison, if you wanted to know what somebody knew,
13 you'd establish a foundation to find out what he knew.

14 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: And I realize that the declaration
16 submitted in the Blecker matter didn't mention profit
17 withdrawals at all. All Mr. Madoff said was that if
18 somebody was going to request a withdrawal, they would write
19 a letter, I wouldn't send them money without it.

20 MS. BROWN: And --

21 THE COURT: Now I suppose that somebody could say,
22 don't reinvest my dividends, don't send them to me, which is
23 what the theory of the profit withdrawals were, that they
24 were just sending the dividends from the fictitious
25 transactions.

1 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: But that's really a question, I guess,
3 late at the end of the day.

4 MS. BROWN: Okay.

5 THE COURT: In other words, if he testifies, look,
6 I don't know anything about profit withdrawals, but I know
7 that in the absence of the record request, we wouldn't send
8 any money (indiscernible) in that business, you know, take
9 it for what it's worth. But we don't know what he knows.

10 MS. BROWN: Yeah, we just feel that his testimony
11 is specifically contradicted by the books and records that
12 we have.

13 THE COURT: Doesn't that go to the weigh, though?

14 MS. BROWN: It might go to the weight.

15 And then the second issue I wanted to raise is,
16 that within his declaration he does testify to general
17 broker dealer practices, which I would submit he's not an
18 appropriate witness to discuss general broker dealer
19 practices in the industry.

20 So for those reasons we don't think his deposition
21 should go forward.

22 THE COURT: I guess that would go to the weight
23 also. So very specifically, I assume he -- well maybe he
24 could or could not testify, of his own knowledge, that BLMIS
25 would not send money to anybody unless they first requested

1 it.

2 MS. BROWN: To the extent he has that knowledge.

3 We think that there are other employees that were involved
4 in the day to day workings of sending checks to customers,
5 sending payments to customers, creating fictitious entries.

6 And we think they would be the most -- the employees that --

7 THE COURT: Yeah, but --

8 MS. BROWN: -- are the most knowledgeable.

9 THE COURT: -- from what I saw from your motion to
10 extend the schedule, those people are also convicted felons
11 who are in prison. So --

12 MS. BROWN: They are. But there -- the difference
13 between Mr. Madoff and those employees, in addition to just
14 the one that's obvious on its face, that Mr. Madoff is on
15 one end of the spectrum and these employees are on another,
16 is that these employees were actually working day to day
17 with these payments and these transactions.

18 THE COURT: I don't necessarily disagree with you
19 that they're better -- they will be more knowledgeable
20 witnesses, but I can't say that Mr. Madoff doesn't know
21 anything about this.

22 MS. BROWN: Okay. Your Honor, well then we would
23 request that you enter the limiting order that we've
24 outlined here today.

25 THE COURT: Yeah, I don't -- look, I'm going to

Page 85

1 grant the motion. I think the information is certainly
2 relevant to the case. There are something like 91,000 of
3 these profit withdrawals in the records. And I read both
4 experts' reports, Calura and Greenblatt. It's a significant
5 issue. The trustee has attempted to reconstruct what
6 occurred, and to a large extent, extrapolate the results of
7 the more recent records to earlier periods, which I guess is
8 the problem. You wouldn't even be having this discussion if
9 we were just talking about this last ten years, I don't
10 know. But for instance, in Mr. Blecker's case, all of his
11 deposits and supposedly withdrawals occurred more than ten
12 years ago when there were apparently no bank records.

13 MS. BROWN: That's correct, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: So I'll allow it, consistent with the
15 limiting provisions which are in the Picower opposition and
16 I'll further direct that the transcript be held
17 confidentially for some period of time --

18 MS. BROWN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: -- since there's a lot of public
20 interest, I guess in this. Some period of time to make --
21 to give the parties an opportunity to make redaction
22 requests.

23 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

24 THE COURT: Let's say 30 days after it's received
25 or actually I think ECM -- ECF gives you 90 days, doesn't

1 it?

2 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: I --

3 MS. BROWN: I believe so.

4 THE COURT: How will that interfere with the
5 progress of the litigation on this issue, if it's a full 90
6 days?

7 MS. BROWN: The profit withdrawal issue?

8 THE COURT: No, let's split the difference, let's
9 make it 60 days.

10 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Can -- Your Honor, can we say
11 that or until the issues are resolved by the Court? Because
12 if the 30-day period expires, but the issues about
13 confidentiality or redaction haven't been addressed --

14 THE COURT: Oh, yes. The later of --

15 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes.

16 THE COURT: -- provided that a redaction request
17 is made within 30 days, then the matter will remain
18 confidential until those issues are resolved, certainly.

19 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: And those requests should be
20 made to the Court under seal, I assume. Otherwise you
21 defeat the purpose of the confidentiality.

22 THE COURT: I see. Yeah. Any objection to that,
23 Mr. Dexter? Well how -- the other side has to know also,
24 because they have to be able to respond.

25 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: They would be privy to the

Page 87

1 motion, but they would be subject to the same
2 confidentiality and sealing requirements.

3 THE COURT: All right. What if you do this, why
4 don't you settle a proposed order, a notice with the various
5 restrictions, limitations we've discussed and that'll give
6 Ms. Chaitman and Mr. Dexter an opportunity to respond. If
7 there are any disputes, then we can work them out.

8 MS. BROWN: And so just to clarify, the redaction
9 request needs to be made within 30 days?

10 THE COURT: No, I said 60. I was laboring between
11 90 and 30, so I made it 60. Requests have to be made within
12 60 days and then the transcript will continue to remain
13 confidential, pending the resolution of those redaction
14 requests. The redaction requests will be filed under seal,
15 but they will be shared with counsel who will hold them in
16 confidence until -- you know, and then you deal with how
17 those requests, when, and if the requests are resolved.

18 MS. BROWN: Okay.

19 THE COURT: All right?

20 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

22 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Thank you.

23 MR. DEXTER: Just so we're clear. A settlement of
24 a proposed order is going to be circulated to determine the
25 -- all the terms that we've just set?

1 THE COURT: You better settle it because they're
2 not in a hurry to have the deposition taken.

3 MR. DEXTER: No, but I'm not clear on whether you
4 ruled that the limiting orders proposed have been entered,
5 or whether that's going to be something that we're going to
6 have an opportunity --

7 THE COURT: No, no.

8 MR. DEXTER: -- to respond to.

9 THE COURT: There are going to be the limitations,
10 consistent with what the Picower Parties proposed, since I
11 think they were broader than what the trustee proposed. And
12 they're the ones who really had the ax to grind on this one.
13 If you object to the phraseology, they put something in,
14 you'll certainly have an opportunity to object. But my
15 understanding, from your reply, is that you didn't really
16 object to the limitations that were proposed, anyway.

17 MR. DEXTER: All right. If we could, maybe may I
18 propose we have an opportunity to submit a reply to the
19 scope as proposed and it could just be --

20 THE COURT: No, I just ruled --

21 MR. DEXTER: -- decided on (indiscernible)?

22 THE COURT: -- I just ruled on it.

23 MR. DEXTER: Okay.

24 THE COURT: You had the opportunity. You -- did
25 you read your papers?

1 MR. DEXTER: Yes. And --

2 THE COURT: And all your -- will you please number
3 your pages when you submit your pleadings. You didn't
4 number the briefs in the -- on the motion to compel.

5 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

6 Your Honor, I just want to clarify, the Picower
7 Parties and the trustee can settle the order or --

8 THE COURT: If you want.

9 MS. BROWN: Okay.

10 THE COURT: If the order's never signed then --

11 MS. BROWN: It was a little unclear to us.

12 THE COURT: -- it's not going to be --

13 MS. BROWN: All right.

14 THE COURT: -- anybody can settle the order, I
15 just thought that --

16 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: We can do that.

17 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, we're happy to settle the
18 order.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Yes. We'll work together.

21 THE COURT: All right. Let me just -- remember
22 that Mr. Kirby can participate.

23 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: You know what bothers me about the
25 response, looking at it again, the reply, after you accuse

Page 90

1 the Picower Parties of paranoia, notwithstanding Mr. -- the
2 declaration submitted in the Blecker case, which included
3 information about Picower, the last paragraph says, in any
4 event, you respectfully asked the Court to set the
5 limitations on the deposition of Madoff, bearing in mind the
6 relevance of his testimony to many of the adversary
7 proceedings and the practical difficulties of deposing him
8 while he's in prison. How can you use this deposition in
9 adversary proceedings if the other parties to the adversary
10 proceedings are not -- may not be present?

11 MR. DEXTER: Well in some cases the parties are
12 the same.

13 THE COURT: Well to the extent they're the same,
14 then they're present.

15 MR. DEXTER: I think the point is that we should
16 just take a couple days to clarify what exactly the scope
17 is. And the point here is that if we're going down there,
18 if we're going to North Carolina, it should be clear what
19 exactly the scope is.

20 THE COURT: Let me ask -- let me raise a different
21 issue, or a related issue. Let's suppose that in course of
22 this profit withdrawal limitation I conclude you're wrong,
23 where you haven't proved what you say you're going to prove.
24 Couldn't that be used in subsequent transfer -- not -- in
25 fraudulent transfer litigation against you to require you to

1 recompute the amount of principle that was withdrawn?

2 MS. BROWN: I mean it would be --

3 THE COURT: In other words it would -- the profit
4 withdrawal issue has ramifications beyond the claim
5 allowance procedures, because I assume that the trustee
6 followed the same procedure with respect to adversary
7 proceedings where he's seeking to recover either fictitious
8 profits or all the principle.

9 MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. I mean we've always
10 described it as two sides of the same coin. The way that
11 you reach each calculation is based on the same --

12 THE COURT: I'm not so sure --

13 MS. BROWN: -- transaction.

14 THE COURT: -- it is. I'll tell you why. And I
15 raised this before. There may be a difference between the
16 trustee's computing withdrawals for the purpose of SIPA,
17 where he has to be personally satisfied from the books and
18 records and the way of computing withdrawals and fraudulent
19 transaction litigation which SIPA has nothing to do with,
20 it's just a fraudulent transfer case.

21 MS. BROWN: Your Honor, I think that goes to the
22 -- whose burden it is. I don't think it goes to the actual
23 calculation. And under SIPA it's the customer's burden to
24 substantiate their claims, similar to any preferred status
25 in any bankruptcy.

Page 92

1 THE COURT: I guess I'm raising a different issue.

2 MS. BROWN: Okay.

3 THE COURT: Suppose the trustee says, you know

4 what, I just don't believe Madoff, I don't believe
5 Bongiorno, depending on what she says about this, or Crupi,
6 depending on what she says about this, I believe my expert.
7 And based on my expert's analysis and the extrapolation of
8 that analysis, I believe that PW represents an actual
9 withdrawal from the account.

10 Is that enough, even if I think that maybe Madoff,
11 let's use an example, Bongiorno and Crupi are right, in
12 other words, as long as the trustee reasonably relies on the
13 information he has, does it matter if he's right? Because
14 he would have to be in a fraudulent transfer litigation
15 where his reasonable reliance is (indiscernible) really an
16 issue.

17 MS. BROWN: Well I think the Second Circuit case
18 law on the trustee's duties and obligations gives the
19 trustee some -- wide latitude in determining that equity,
20 and it may not be the same burden in a fraudulent transfer
21 action. But I do think that goes to burdens and not the
22 underlying calculation.

23 THE COURT: I'm not so sure, but we'll see.

24 All right. You can settle an order.

25 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 MS. RESSLER HARRIS: Thank you.

2 THE COURT: Thank you.

3 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
5 12:49 PM)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 | INDEX

2

RULINGS

4

Page **Line**

5

6 Motions to Dismiss are Denied.

71 3-4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2

1 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

2

3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

5

Sonya
Ledanski Hyde

Digitally signed by Sonya Ledanski
Hyde
DN: cn=Sonya Ledanski Hyde,
o=Veritext, ou,
email=digital@veritext.com, c=US
Date: 2016.03.24 11:01:08 -04'00'

6

Sonya Ledanski Hyde

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 Veritext Legal Solutions

21 330 Old Country Road

22 Suite 300

23 Mineola, NY 11501

24

25 Date: March 23, 2016

[& - account]

Page 1

&	16 11:19 169 59:4 16th 24:15 18 52:8 184 62:1 186 62:1 18th 8:15 21:24 19 59:8 1975 57:20 1995 59:17 1996 59:5 1999 37:6 19th 8:8 11:9,23 55:6 1s0324 35:18	25th 57:1 70:9,10 26 23:13,14 38:4 41:23 43:14,22 45:7 52:6 26th 52:21 57:4 27 12:5 50:14 27th 41:4 70:11,13 28th 24:15 298 62:1 2nd 11:8	57892 57:24 6 60 86:9 87:10,11,12 63,259 63:25 6th 70:1 7 71 94:6 76 63:23 78 64:7,9 79 64:8,9
0		3	8
0086 36:25 0118 35:19,21 36:12 0324 36:24 08-01789 1:3 3:1,4 3:7 0866 37:1	10 36:8 10-04324 2:2 3:13 10-04898 1:11 3:10 100 38:21 10004 2:14 10022 4:7 5:11 10036 5:4 10111 4:17 1026013 61:24 10:40 2:17 11 6:20 7:18 12:7,7 49:19 50:7 51:17 79:5 1121 57:19 1126 57:20 1127 59:16 11501 95:23 11th 12:11 51:11 52:25 54:10,17,25 56:21 1211 5:3 125,000 11:8,24 13:15 63:1 12:49 93:5 13 51:18 13,266 36:13 130,000 65:5 14 51:19,23 72:15 72:19,24 73:3 140,000 12:10 63:5 15 11:22 12:3,15 37:2 51:24 150,000 11:8,21 13:14 63:1 65:5	3 52:7 53:13 57:11 61:8 3-4 94:6 30 9:14 49:24 50:18 51:22 53:17 54:20 66:16 69:6 70:6 85:24 86:12,17 87:9 87:11 300 95:22 31 50:11 324 63:22 64:12 330 95:21 3652764 59:8 37 8:4 52:22 53:7 56:7 3rd 52:15 53:13 54:4	9 90 85:25 86:5 87:11 91,000 85:2 919 5:10 99 16:16 9th 32:13
1	2	4	a
1 61:24 10 36:8 10-04324 2:2 3:13 10-04898 1:11 3:10 100 38:21 10004 2:14 10022 4:7 5:11 10036 5:4 10111 4:17 1026013 61:24 10:40 2:17 11 6:20 7:18 12:7,7 49:19 50:7 51:17 79:5 1121 57:19 1126 57:20 1127 59:16 11501 95:23 11th 12:11 51:11 52:25 54:10,17,25 56:21 1211 5:3 125,000 11:8,24 13:15 63:1 12:49 93:5 13 51:18 13,266 36:13 130,000 65:5 14 51:19,23 72:15 72:19,24 73:3 140,000 12:10 63:5 15 11:22 12:3,15 37:2 51:24 150,000 11:8,21 13:14 63:1 65:5	2 11:20 2000 13:18 2001 9:25 2003 39:12 40:9 58:13 2004 19:15,19,21 20:4 23:5,10 27:12 27:15,17,21 28:3,10 42:21,22 45:1 2006 7:5 12:7,11 34:15 2006-2008 33:17 2007 11:8,21 39:13 2008 11:9,24 12:7 13:5,5,18 34:15 39:13 50:7 2009 7:6 39:13 50:12 61:23,24 2011 59:8,8 70:2 2013 57:24,24 2014 53:13 62:1 2016 2:16 50:14 51:11,17 52:7,8 54:24 61:8 95:25 21 11:25 12:3,16 22 11:22 61:7 22nd 70:12 23 2:16 95:25 25 52:5	300 95:22 31 50:11 324 63:22 64:12 330 95:21 3652764 59:8 37 8:4 52:22 53:7 56:7 3rd 52:15 53:13 54:4	aaron 4:4 74:20 abeyance 66:15 abide 46:7 ability 43:22 able 31:5,23 44:10 44:16 86:24 absence 51:16 56:23 57:16 83:7 absent 52:4 54:12 55:2 absolute 59:9 absolutely 70:20 73:6 academic 44:25 accept 13:7 25:1 acceptable 66:1 access 45:24 46:7 accomplish 62:20 62:21 accomplished 32:6 account 11:20,23 12:6,8,10 25:16 26:1,4,7,8,14 27:4,8 35:17,18,21 36:10
	5		

[account - aside]

Page 2

36:12,18,25,25 37:1 37:2 54:12 61:2,6 63:22 64:9,11,12 65:10 66:8 92:9 accountant 10:7,12 10:15 61:13 62:18 accountant's 10:3,9 61:14 62:16 accounts 35:17,17 35:20 36:11 37:3 58:10 59:23 63:16 63:17 64:3 65:4 accuracy 59:25 60:6 65:7 accurate 60:2 95:4 accuse 89:25 accused 51:2,7 achieved 22:17 acknowledged 24:11,12 74:2 acknowledging 74:25 action 53:10 79:23 92:21 actions 7:18 50:25 actual 91:22 92:8 ad 49:7 added 45:21 addition 25:10 54:3 55:9 63:9 79:16 84:13 additional 32:6 51:1 78:23 address 55:24 56:10 77:19 addressed 17:20 86:13 adherence 56:18 adjectives 40:20 adjourn 66:16 67:22,24 70:14 adjourned 69:10 70:6 adjourning 69:5 adjustment 58:7 administrative 59:15	admission 7:12 10:9 14:3 22:16 23:1,17 30:11 31:16,25 33:3 33:6 34:13,22 36:12 38:22 51:8,23 52:10 52:11,17 61:15 62:15,17 64:7 67:10 admissions 8:12 9:4 13:4,6 21:12 22:7 22:10,12,13,24 23:10 29:15,24 30:2 31:4 35:6 37:16,17 39:3 49:25 50:20 52:14 53:5,18 54:21 55:19,22,23 58:9 61:11 67:9,16 admit 7:23,24 8:2 8:11 9:17 10:14 11:19,22 12:5 13:5 13:9,11,11,12,20,23 20:16 24:19 25:13 34:19 37:19,21 38:15 39:2 53:3 60:7 61:11 62:23 admits 20:18 61:3 admitted 7:6 9:15 13:18 36:3,7,14,16 36:19 50:21 61:9 63:18 64:3,5 65:1,5 65:13 admonition 58:17 adopting 43:14 adv 1:3,11 2:2 advance 7:21 8:10 9:1,5 24:18 34:18 49:4 advancing 22:22 adverbs 40:20 adversary 19:18,23 27:23 42:18 45:3 49:19,21 50:4,21 51:9 52:18 53:2 54:9 90:6,9,9 91:6 advise 51:3 70:15 advocated 56:18 affect 63:6 68:17	affirmative 14:16 14:22 15:16,17 16:1 16:3,9,12 20:21 39:7,9,10,15,21 40:3,8 50:24 58:5 60:10 63:10 65:1 agencies 79:24 agent 15:4 ago 40:6 45:25 85:12 agree 17:24 22:15 31:13 32:5 33:15,22 34:9,11,20,23 41:18 42:20 43:5 55:7 75:3 agreeable 78:1,2 agreed 17:4 29:7 34:21 56:4 60:19 agreement 24:10,11 54:5 ahead 6:23 24:1 77:6 81:20,20 al 2:8 4:5 allegation 41:15 alleged 49:22 50:4 allegedly 54:2 allow 20:6 33:6 37:7 38:6,8 42:8 72:13 78:14 85:14 allowance 91:5 allowed 23:14 35:2 allowing 43:13 alluded 23:7 alpern 52:2 alternatively 56:14 amend 38:19 40:11 amended 52:14 54:4 americas 5:3 amount 11:21,24 26:7 63:7 91:1 amounts 50:6 analysis 92:7,8 andrew 43:25 ands 87:17 announced 22:14 27:16	answer 7:22,24 8:1 9:2,23 11:22,22,25 12:7 14:17 20:25 22:3 29:23,25 31:4 35:24 40:9,11 41:21 63:23 answers 9:12,14,16 9:17 11:19 12:2 23:23,23 33:16 34:2 34:10,14,18,25 35:8 38:19 41:21 anybody 35:11 83:25 89:14 anyway 88:16 apparently 29:12 39:17 50:17 85:12 appeal 72:10,11,12 73:10 appearance 45:9 appeared 54:18 applicable 24:23 46:20 application 3:7 applies 39:11 60:22 apply 39:22 42:11 47:1 56:10 appreciate 71:22 apprise 72:17 approach 53:22 appropriate 16:5,7 27:17 31:14 53:23 55:13 77:11 83:18 appropriately 17:1 april 11:8,20 61:24 70:8 areas 10:19 aren't 15:11 27:3 argue 57:7 58:23 argued 52:23 arguing 13:19 31:9 37:20 argument 9:22 18:4 65:21 arises 50:12 arties 79:1 aside 32:10 42:17 67:5
---	--	---	--

[asked - cases]

Page 3

asked 16:14 80:7 90:4 asking 33:11 65:11 75:2,2,5 76:14,19 aspect 49:14 assert 14:22 16:3 39:19 57:9 asserted 14:9 16:2 50:24 58:6,19 64:15 asserting 58:13 assertion 60:12 assume 34:18 35:3 83:23 86:20 91:5 assuming 34:24 attacking 40:23 attempt 37:13 73:10 attempted 85:5 attending 80:22 attention 45:20 46:13 attorney 4:4,13 5:2 5:9 47:18 50:15 attorneys 17:3,6 45:17 51:6 attributable 58:15 attributed 51:1 august 59:8 authoritative 74:2 authority 18:9 53:19 authorize 53:9 authorized 56:22 authorizes 53:7 avenue 4:6 5:3,10 avoid 43:3 avoidance 42:17 await 56:4 aware 8:18 26:16 ax 88:12	badway 46:2 73:10 baker 4:12 80:14 balance 59:12 bank 5:2 6:19 10:21 25:7,11,15,16 26:25 27:3,3 32:11 35:10 37:8,14 47:19 48:6 49:24 50:13,23 51:3 51:21 53:2 54:8 56:2,6 57:6 58:1,2 59:7,20,23 60:4,9 60:14,18,19,25 61:1 61:1,22 65:3,8,15 65:22 66:5,6,7,17 66:18,21,23,23,25 70:24 71:9 73:11 85:12 bankruptcy 1:1 2:12,25 59:8 91:25 banks 23:11 45:9 50:9 51:12 52:1 54:11,25 55:1,7,8 69:9,25 70:16 bar 20:3 23:13 46:12,14 barbanel 37:4,5,6,7 37:9 38:11,12,13,23 52:2 55:14 64:19,19 69:21 barbara 3:14 6:11 barcelona 77:23 barry 5:6 71:8 based 7:19 32:14 49:22 62:11 91:11 92:7 baseless 40:20 42:2 basically 25:13 basis 15:3 17:18 23:18 32:10 41:24 42:6,9 57:6 67:14 69:14 bear 59:2 67:4 bearing 90:5 beginning 50:10 66:8 behalf 71:8 76:10	believe 24:25 27:14 27:24 60:1 70:13 73:24 86:3 92:4,4,6 92:8 bell 5:18 bench 22:14 bencher 33:13 benefit 13:24 26:21 bernard 1:8,13 2:4 3:5 4:14,20 48:1 78:5 berNSTein 2:24 best 38:5 better 42:23,24 84:19 88:1 beyond 91:4 bin 21:14 blecker 4:4 74:20 75:17,19 82:16 90:2 blecker's 74:22 85:10 blmis 58:11,24 59:21 60:2,6 63:11 65:8,24 83:24 board 67:20,24 boat 59:4 bongiorno 92:5,11 book 62:1 books 23:2 62:1 83:11 91:17 bothered 34:12 bothers 89:24 bottom 44:8 bowling 2:13 breed 61:21 brief 6:25 28:12 48:16,17,21 77:25 briefed 28:7,13 briefing 48:22 briefs 73:19 89:4 broader 88:11 broker 83:17,18 brought 21:9 79:23 brown 4:21 76:9,10 76:23 77:5,7 80:8 80:12,14,20,22 81:2 81:18,21 82:2,8,10	82:14,20 83:1,4,10 83:14 84:2,8,12,22 85:13,18 86:3,7 87:8,18,20 89:5,9 89:11,13,17,23 91:2 91:9,13,21 92:2,17 92:25 brunswick 59:4 burden 13:13 15:15 57:23 59:3 60:17 91:22,23 92:20 burdens 92:21 burdensome 15:11 16:11,13 business 44:11 83:8 c c 4:1 6:1 95:1,1 calculation 91:11 91:23 92:22 calendar 73:15 call 17:20 68:10,13 called 41:5 calura 85:4 carolina 81:16 90:18 case 1:3,11 2:2 6:22 7:11 9:3 10:8,10 11:1,4 15:2 16:17 19:7 20:7,10 22:23 25:5 29:10,24 33:3 34:19 38:11 39:8,9 39:21 42:2,13,19,25 43:6 44:5 46:20,21 46:23,23,25 47:1,13 47:15,23,25,25 48:2 48:4,6,8 50:17 54:7 54:22 59:17 60:2,3 67:11 68:21 73:22 78:11 85:2,10 90:2 91:20 92:17 cases 6:21 7:25 11:2 16:2 20:23 21:14,15 21:23,25 22:1,10,15 24:2,4 26:13 31:24 33:18 38:21 39:5 42:2 49:14 52:3,12 52:19,23 54:1,1
 b b 2:23 8:4,5 43:25 52:22 53:9,11 56:7 back 22:13 28:21 39:8 44:17 63:23 65:10,23 66:7 67:16 68:13 70:8 71:17	bear 59:2 67:4 bearing 90:5 beginning 50:10 66:8 behalf 71:8 76:10	Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com	516-608-2400

[cases - consistent]

Page 4

55:23 56:1,25 57:25 59:9 62:25 69:6,21 75:6 80:7 90:11 cause 6:6 22:22 30:14 43:11,12 44:13 56:14,15 cavalierly 41:14 century 45:25 certain 11:17 13:7 23:17 35:7 49:24 50:25 56:10 certainly 19:12 20:24 25:1,17 26:24 36:9,24 43:23 48:12 48:16 74:8 85:1 86:18 88:14 certified 95:3 chaitman 3:13 4:3 4:10 6:15 9:18,18 9:20 17:15 18:22 20:5 21:22 22:10 23:7 24:6,8 25:21 25:23 26:2,10,16 27:9,19,23 28:6,11 29:2 30:6 35:23,25 36:16,22 39:24 40:22 41:14 42:12 42:12 49:20,20 51:1 51:3,5,7 52:6,21 53:14 55:19 69:13 76:16 77:9,16,19,22 79:21 87:6 chaitman's 22:24 challenge 57:21 challenged 59:25 challenging 65:7 chambers 24:10,11 50:14 51:7 chance 33:6 change 33:9,12 changed 25:3 33:25 changing 24:24 characterization 11:17 characterized 13:17 charged 41:13	chart 21:19,21 check 26:7 64:1,14 checks 84:4 choice 61:3 chrysler 57:19 circle 28:21 circuit 18:9 26:22 57:20 59:16 92:17 circulated 87:24 circumvent 27:15 cited 53:19 59:17 civil 8:5 27:13 52:22 57:11 claim 57:9,10,16 65:21 66:9,12 91:4 claims 60:15 91:24 clarify 9:9 25:11 87:8 89:6 90:16 clarity 44:16 clear 18:3 30:10 39:10 40:7 70:24 87:23 88:3 90:18 clearly 18:11 49:4 clerk 70:9 client 25:15 clients 22:24 23:1 80:18 close 21:7 closed 58:22 59:14 cohen 22:18 cohmad 46:1,20 72:9 73:7,8 coin 91:10 colleague 22:3 colleagues 21:8 41:9 collecting 57:25 59:9 colloquy 9:13 colonial 43:2 come 24:6 28:6 40:18 41:20 45:2 70:8 71:17 comes 17:14 41:14 coming 25:1 67:20 77:24	commence 45:3 commenced 50:4 commercial 33:14 commit 48:1 commitment 51:21 committed 53:12 communications 8:23,24 company 61:23 compel 3:10 6:19 21:24 29:21 49:24 51:18 56:5 62:24 64:18,23 66:15 70:24 89:4 compelling 53:9 compensation 44:20 complaining 14:18 complaint 27:20 42:10 49:9 57:9 complaints 7:17 17:12 complete 66:24 compliance 8:25 21:25 22:5 30:17 31:3,6 33:7 40:3 49:24 51:18 52:5,20 53:1,25 54:7,14,24 55:15 56:6,22,25 62:22,24 63:21 64:18,24 66:15 69:5 69:24 71:10 73:11 79:19 complicated 8:19 comply 3:11 6:19 25:3 34:4 51:4 53:8 53:10 54:11 55:1 computation 63:7 computing 65:17 91:16,18 conceded 25:13 conceding 45:4 concern 74:16 concerns 11:18 50:16 60:17 62:3,12 74:15	concession 50:25 conclude 34:18 90:22 concluded 62:2 93:4 conclusion 60:22 78:19 concord 59:4 condition 66:5 conditions 77:17,25 78:2,20,21 79:9 conduct 7:20 54:2 73:16,20 conducted 56:20 74:14 conduit 14:12 15:4 64:16 confer 51:13 55:6 56:16,20 conference 24:14 50:14 51:7,10 55:1 55:6,9 56:16 70:15 conferences 56:21 confidence 17:5 47:11 62:9 69:25 87:16 confidential 45:16 45:17 60:20 79:18 86:18 87:13 confidentiality 17:1 17:9 49:3 71:12 86:13,21 87:2 confidentially 85:17 confirmed 51:20 confusing 30:9 48:10 confusion 55:12 congress 43:15,21 43:22 connection 21:22 55:25 consent 76:20 78:5 consisted 12:8 consistent 10:2,18 61:12 62:16 71:12 78:3,6 85:14 88:10
--	---	---	---

[contacting - defendant's]

Page 5

contacting 51:3,12 55:7,8	course 16:8 30:22 90:21	69:4,9,13,20 70:4 70:10,12,14,19,21	70:15 73:3 95:25 dated 52:6 56:24 61:7
contained 35:6 58:2 58:3	court 1:1 2:12 6:2,7 6:9,18,20 7:2,8,16 8:3,4,6,7,14,20 9:3 9:11,20 10:2,6,13	71:1,3,7,14,16,19 71:24 72:2,5,7,11 72:12,15,17,19,23 72:25 73:2,4,7,13	david 4:19 davis 52:6 day 8:15,16,22 23:5 41:9 51:6 72:15,19 83:3 84:4,4,16,16 86:12
contempt 41:13 51:6	10:23 11:2,7,16	73:23 74:1,4,11,15	days 9:14 34:4 49:25 50:18 51:22 53:17 54:20 66:16 69:6 70:6 71:21 72:24 73:3 78:7 85:24,25 86:6,9,17 87:9,12 90:16
contend 58:12	12:4,17,20 13:1,10	75:2,16,19,23 76:2	deal 7:9 20:16,20 28:5 67:8 87:16
contends 61:19	13:19,25 14:6,21	76:5,7,22,24 77:6	dealer 83:17,18 dealing 38:21 44:1 75:13
contest 38:24	15:1,9,13,19 16:2	77:17,20,22 78:9,13	dealt 45:18 47:4,6 62:14
context 8:23 11:13 18:21 26:18 29:6 42:1 44:14 61:22 71:9 77:14	16:13,19,24 17:4,13 17:15,24 18:1,7,13 18:16,19,23 19:1,4	78:16,24 79:7,9,14 80:1,6,9,13,16,21 80:25 81:3,3,9,12	debtor 73:21 deceased 21:1 52:18 deceive 34:2 december 12:6,7,11 50:7,11 52:14
continuation 6:5	19:7,11,13,20,24	81:17,20,25 82:6,9	decide 47:21 decided 24:22 47:22 88:21
continue 20:12 28:15 87:12	20:9,14,25 21:3,11 21:14,19,21 22:5	82:11,15,21 83:2,5 83:13,22 84:7,9,18	decides 38:1 declaration 52:6 61:6 74:20 75:12,14 75:22,25 81:22 82:8 82:15 83:16 90:2
contract 14:10 15:7 58:21 63:12	23:15 24:5,16,21,22 25:1,21,24 26:6,13	84:25 85:14,19,24 86:4,8,11,14,16,20	defeat 86:21 defects 53:7 defendant 1:9,18 2:9 9:24 28:16 38:22 46:22 48:8 50:21,24 54:3 58:6 58:18 60:5,24 61:9
contradicted 83:11	27:3,17,18,21 28:1	86:22 87:3,10,19,21	62:11 65:7 66:6 68:10
contravenes 30:23 31:7 61:15	28:9,14,17,23,25 29:4,11,17 30:4,7	88:1,7,9,20,22,24 89:2,8,10,12,14,19	defendant's 12:20 20:1 52:9 53:6
control 26:8 58:24	30:13,19,21 31:1,9	89:21,24 90:4,13,20 91:3,12,14 92:1,3	
convenience 24:13	31:13,21 32:4,18,21	92:23 93:2	
conversation 39:23	32:23 33:1,4,9,11	court's 24:24 32:12	
convicted 84:10	33:12,22 34:5,9,17	52:3,25 53:12 54:8 54:17,25 58:17	
copy 11:12 72:23	35:2,11,14,16,24	courthouse 45:15	
corporation 1:5 57:19 59:4	36:10,19,24 37:11 37:15,20 38:1,4,10	courts 59:5	
correct 32:3 43:8 45:10 64:22 85:13	38:15,19 39:4,16,23 40:2,5,10,13,16	cover 35:12	
correctly 46:4	41:11,14,20 42:16	covered 35:12	
corresponding 36:10	43:5,9 44:4,7,12,18 44:21,25 45:6,8,12	covers 6:20,21 39:4	
corrupting 42:4	46:6,17 47:2,9,14	created 41:23	
cattle 76:16	47:18 48:3,9,16,17	creating 84:5	
counsel 3:14 22:19 23:4,6,24 29:24 55:20 67:20,21,24 68:4,5,9,22 69:1 76:13 79:13,17 80:9 87:15	48:21 49:6,10,13,16 49:18,23 51:2,10,11 51:14,15,20 52:24	credit 12:9 63:4	
count 64:17	53:7,10,11,14,21	crummy 43:25,25	
counterbalance 60:11	54:2,10 55:3,6,10 55:17,24 56:5,10,17	crupi 92:5,11	
country 95:21	56:20 57:13 59:11	current 50:12	
couple 90:16	62:2,12 63:20 64:6 64:9,12,23 65:9,13	customer's 91:23	
	65:15 66:1,4,14,21	customers 73:19 75:10 78:5 84:4,5	
	67:1,4,7,16,22,25	cyber 45:20	
	68:2,5,15,20,24	d	
		d 6:1 52:22 53:7 56:8 57:11 94:1	
		date 24:15,16 28:5 29:9 50:7,11 70:7,7	

[defendant's - dropped]

Page 6

54:23 62:4 65:25	depose 75:1 78:5	34:8,14,24 35:5,13	56:17
defendants 3:1 4:5	deposed 74:23	35:15 37:5,12,18,21	discretion 53:12
6:13,15,25 7:2,6,22	depositing 90:7	37:23 38:3,13,17,20	discuss 47:20 83:18
7:23,25 8:11 9:1	deposit 26:13	39:7,21 40:1,7,12	discussed 67:14
11:4 14:9 16:16	deposited 10:16	40:15 45:14 46:18	87:5
17:1 18:3 22:16	58:11 59:22 61:5	46:19 47:5,12,23	discussion 24:7
24:19 33:6 35:9	deposition 3:4 6:4	48:4,15,19,25 49:7	44:25 85:8
47:23 49:1,19 50:1	6:12 70:22 73:14,16	64:4,5,7,11,22 66:1	dismiss 7:17,18,19
50:3,5,8 53:2,19	73:20 74:14,16 75:4	66:2,11 69:17,19	19:5 49:14,21 50:2
54:15 55:13 56:2,14	75:7 76:12 79:19	72:6,8,13,16,22	52:23 53:6,10 56:1
57:2,5,25 58:4,10	80:22 81:13,14,19	73:18,25 74:8,12,24	56:7 71:3 72:21
58:12,16,23 59:1,17	81:21 82:1,4 83:20	75:8,18,21,24 76:3	94:6
59:18,22,22,25 60:1	88:2 90:5,8	76:6 77:1,18,21	dismissal 3:2 53:11
60:4,6,12,15 62:6,9	deposits 11:5 12:10	78:2,11,14 79:1,4	53:20 54:9
63:9 65:22	13:18 20:19 36:14	81:15 86:23 87:6,23	dismissed 42:14
defense 14:9,17,22	37:5 50:9 53:4 63:5	88:3,8,17,21,23	57:10 72:20
15:13,16,17 16:4,5	63:5 65:2 85:11	89:1 90:11,15 93:3	disposition 55:16
24:3 39:9,10,11,15	deprive 61:21	dictated 57:2	dispute 7:1,3 9:25
39:19,22,24 40:3,8	described 91:10	difference 84:12	10:20,22 11:1,4
50:24 58:13,17,19	designed 34:1 45:2	86:8 91:15	13:17 25:9 46:20
58:23 63:11 64:15	despite 58:17	different 13:25	50:12 55:10,11 60:5
65:1	destroy 43:19	17:13 18:13 31:21	74:22
defenses 16:1,3,9,12	determination	36:1 48:11 90:20	disputed 10:10 13:8
20:21 39:8 58:5	16:21 38:5 56:4	92:1	13:12 60:7
60:10	73:24	difficulties 90:7	disputes 7:11 10:20
defer 20:5	determinations	direct 81:6 85:16	55:9 87:7
delay 67:11	74:1	directed 51:13	dissatisfied 9:15
delivered 51:22	determine 8:12	57:18	district 1:2 72:12
demand 52:5 54:14	37:8 87:24	directing 69:23	73:4
demanding 53:25	determined 28:8	direction 52:4 54:2	dividends 82:22,24
54:24	determining 92:19	directly 51:12 62:12	docket 68:13
denial 11:16 60:15	devices 38:8	disagree 23:12 30:6	documentary 25:14
61:16	dexter 4:9 6:14,15	31:12 32:25 84:18	documents 11:12
denied 11:7,22,25	6:24 7:4,13,19 8:7	disappearing 23:6,8	16:9 25:7,10,18
12:7 32:13 35:18,22	8:17,21 9:7,23,24	43:15	62:5 69:24 71:11
36:6,20,24 37:1,3	10:4,11,17,24 11:3	disclosure 50:9	dog 62:1
50:2 56:8 63:1,2,16	11:11 12:2,15,18,25	57:14 60:20	doing 26:17 27:25
63:24,25 64:1,13,13	13:3,16,23 14:5,15	disclosures 57:6	29:14 36:10 42:4
64:20 71:4 94:6	14:23 15:6,11,15,22	discovery 15:21,22	43:21
denies 37:15	16:7,15,22,25 17:10	16:5,7,8 18:20	dominion 26:8
deny 10:14 11:10	17:14,22 18:3,10,15	19:14 20:1,2,4	58:24
13:14 24:19 39:17	18:18,22 19:2,5,12	21:22 22:1 27:1,12	don 18:22
48:3 63:2	19:16,21 20:5,12,24	27:20,25 28:3,4	doubts 49:1
denying 33:17,18	21:17 28:15,21,24	32:15,18,20 38:7	drastic 53:11,22
69:22	30:4,8,17,20,22	42:1,7,9,10,14,16	drawn 55:21
depending 92:5,6	31:12,17 32:3,12,19	42:18 43:4,12 46:12	dropped 15:18
	32:23 33:4,15,24	49:8 53:9 55:11	

[duplicative - fixed]

Page 7

duplicative 59:24	entitled 27:2,11,24	expecting 68:11	fault 31:5 33:23
duties 92:18	31:18 47:24 58:6	expedite 24:4	fdic 59:16
e	60:8 75:4 76:17	expensive 30:16	february 8:8,15
e 2:23,23 4:1,1 6:1,1	80:16,18	expert 92:6	21:24 24:15 30:25
94:1 95:1	entity 21:4	expert's 92:7	51:11,17,25 52:5,6
earlier 8:9 69:1	entries 74:6,7,13	experts 85:4	52:8,15,21,25 54:4
85:7	84:5	expired 52:10 54:6	54:6,10,17,24,25
ecf 85:25	entry 73:3	54:23	55:6 56:21,24 57:1
echo 42:11	equitable 58:7	expires 86:12	57:4 61:7
ecm 85:25	equity 92:19	explain 12:2	federal 8:5 14:15
edition 53:13	esq 4:13	explained 55:20	27:13 35:5 38:3
education 57:23	essence 67:12	exposed 17:2,3	52:22 53:13 57:11
effect 69:15	essentially 7:20	extend 84:10	feel 81:21 83:10
effective 22:25	47:9 62:18	extended 29:9	feels 40:24
effectively 61:16	establish 15:17 16:1	extension 28:20,25	felons 84:10
efforts 50:12	16:11 82:13	29:17,19	fiasco 41:23
eight 71:24	established 18:5	extensions 29:16	fictitious 50:4,5
either 10:11,14	47:1 49:4	extent 10:2,17	58:8,15 63:7 65:18
50:19 53:3 57:8	establishing 25:19	14:10 25:18 33:12	82:24 84:5 91:7
60:2 91:7	et 2:8 4:4	50:23 55:25 58:7	fiduciary 46:6
eliciting 75:5	event 30:18 45:11	59:19 61:11 62:15	fighting 67:16
ellman 5:1	90:4	77:12 84:2 85:6	filed 57:2 60:23
employees 84:3,6	everybody 30:16	90:13	80:2 87:14
84:13,15,16	65:1	extraordinary	files 27:23
encompassed 16:4	everyone's 15:25	26:18	filings 19:17,22 50:7
36:9	evidence 14:19,21	extrapolate 85:6	50:11 56:17
enforce 21:15,24	14:23 15:16,23	extrapolation 92:7	filter 46:2
31:15,23 32:1 41:7	25:14 50:17 60:8	f	finally 51:20 79:25
50:13,18 51:16,21	evidenced 11:5	f 2:23 95:1	financial 15:6 16:16
52:4 53:16 54:19	evident 81:9	f.2d 57:19	17:23 18:11 31:19
63:20	eviscerate 56:19	f.3d 59:16	33:21 59:7,11,18
enforcement 3:8	ex 27:24	face 9:16 84:14	60:13
6:10 54:5	exactly 27:21 90:16	fact 8:21 50:1 52:10	find 20:17 35:14
enforcing 33:7	90:19	60:7,9 75:11	43:13,20,23 74:14
50:22	examination 19:15	facts 47:12 50:19	82:13
enjoyed 26:20	examinations 73:20	51:23 53:3,18	fine 9:15 70:14
enter 75:9 78:9,14	example 43:24	fail 54:1	71:13
78:17,17,18 84:23	92:11	failed 12:9 60:16	finish 30:4
entered 24:21 31:2	exams 23:10	failure 53:8,10	firm 69:17 80:11
32:24 88:4	exception 7:10 14:8	fair 28:14	first 6:13 10:6
entertain 9:22 73:4	52:8,12	faith 13:11 50:3	16:20 24:9 43:7
entertaining 22:21	exceptions 25:12	familiar 42:6 66:12	44:1 51:13 56:10,13
entire 12:8 26:7	excess 12:5	family 21:10	67:8 77:7 80:1
30:23 37:14	exhibit 52:7	far 43:2 45:6	83:25
entirely 31:6 37:24	exists 26:18 40:8	fast 43:19	five 78:20,21 79:10
48:5	expansive 39:2	fatal 53:7	fixed 61:23

[focusing - honor]

Page 8

focusing 26:23	g	87:24 88:5,5,9 89:12 90:17,18,23	87:22 89:16,20 93:1
follow 34:21 50:2 53:21 76:13	g 6:1 59:7	gonna 44:21 48:22	he'll 72:23
followed 24:17 91:6	gas 43:2	good 6:2,14 13:11 34:3 50:3 56:14,15 71:14 74:8 76:9	hear 24:6,23 39:6 40:16 42:12 76:7
following 9:9 12:11	general 56:10 60:12 60:17 62:3 83:16,18	gotten 27:9	heard 9:19 30:3 35:23 41:8 81:19
footnote 67:18	generally 58:18 77:3	government 58:14	hearing 3:1,4,7,10 3:13 8:9 23:8 51:17 52:25 54:10 56:21
force 29:22	generated 51:1	grant 8:20 69:13,14 69:18 72:9,11,12,15 72:19 78:4 85:1	heightened 45:20
forced 14:22 16:6	germane 43:23	granted 16:10 19:6 28:20 58:14 68:12 68:14,16,20 71:2	held 24:18 47:11 51:10 69:25 85:16
foregoing 95:3	getting 14:25 20:4 30:16 34:11 46:14	granting 29:17 68:16 69:22 74:25	helen 4:10 9:18 22:10 52:6
forget 80:10	gibbons 43:25	green 2:13	helene 4:4 26:2 60:24
forgo 50:22	give 10:15 15:7 41:4 41:7,20 45:21 46:17 47:15 77:8 85:21 87:5	greenberg 47:16,17	help 38:25
formal 56:17	given 24:19 29:23 41:21 55:12 60:13 77:13	greenberg's 47:18	helpful 14:25 23:25
forth 57:12 78:20	gives 18:15 43:19 85:25 92:18	greenblatt 85:4	hereinafter 49:20
forward 23:18 29:20 44:16 46:14 66:22 67:12,14 81:19 83:21	glickman 5:6 71:6,8 71:8,15,18,21 72:1 72:17,18,21	gregory 4:9 6:14	highly 31:19,20 45:16
found 23:24	glitnir 59:7	grind 88:12	history 8:19
foundation 82:13	go 6:23 7:14 14:4 24:1 26:19 28:19 31:15 39:8 40:19 41:2 44:10,16 48:20 65:17 66:22 77:6 81:19,20,20 83:13 83:14,21,22	groundless 40:22 49:15	hold 7:21 8:10,25 9:5 17:4 30:17 62:9 66:14 67:5 70:16 87:15
four 21:23 52:11,17 55:23 69:6	goes 22:13 23:6 46:4 65:9 91:21,22 92:21	group 57:23	holding 15:4 62:22
fourth 77:13	going 8:25 13:5 15:7,8,17,23,24,25 16:8,15,17,20 17:7 17:11,16 23:18 24:3 25:3 26:21 27:11 29:8,12 30:13,17,20	guess 6:16 14:9,12 14:14 28:5 34:22 66:8 69:15 83:2,22 85:7,20 92:1	holds 42:3
frame 17:12 27:20 32:16 49:8 71:18	halpern 19:10 35:13,14,16 63:15 64:2,3 69:21	h	hon 2:24
frankly 20:8 24:1 40:19 75:15	halpern's 64:5	h 1:13 2:4 4:13 5:18	honestly 12:19
fraud 48:1	hand 41:1	halpern 19:10 35:13,14,16 63:15 64:2,3 69:21	honor 6:3,14,24 7:13 9:18 11:11 12:18 13:3 14:15 19:6,10,16 21:2,10 22:2,12,13,18,21 23:4,24 24:8,16,25 26:16 28:7,12,16 30:1,23 35:23 36:17 40:18 41:2,6,25 42:8,21 44:16 45:24 46:3,16 47:7 48:19 49:12 65:6,19 67:6 67:18 68:4 69:8,12 69:19 70:3,13,20 71:6,13 72:4,6,16 72:22 73:6,18 74:24 76:9,11 78:4 80:12
fraudster 44:2	happened 33:8 44:4 73:9	happens 27:7 75:25	
fraudulent 60:15 90:25 91:18,20 92:14,20	happened 33:8 44:4 73:9	happy 38:24 89:17	
frd 59:5 62:1	harris 5:13 78:22 79:3,5,8,12,15 80:5 81:5,11 85:23 86:2 86:10,15,19,25	harris 5:13 78:22 79:3,5,8,12,15 80:5 81:5,11 85:23 86:2 86:10,15,19,25	
free 34:22 51:16 54:14 62:24			
frustration 33:13			
full 86:5			
fund 58:22			
funds 58:20 61:23			
further 18:4 25:11 31:16 34:12 48:22 51:15 56:5,11 85:16			
furthermore 52:16 55:4 59:23 61:17			
futile 78:12			
future 28:5			

[honor - kwon]

Page 9

81:2,5,18 82:14 83:1 84:22 85:13 86:10 87:20 89:5,6 89:17,23 91:9,21 92:25 93:3 honor's 42:6 43:13 73:12 hostetler 4:12 hundreds 17:3 22:16,19 hurry 88:2 husband 43:24 44:2 hyde 3:25 95:3,8 hypothetical 35:2 75:3	industry 83:19 inform 68:4 information 10:15 10:21 14:25 15:25 17:11,19,19 18:20 19:3,19,25 20:21 23:5 33:21 37:22,24 37:25 38:8,11,18 45:2 50:9 57:7,8 58:3 59:7,11,12,19 59:20,24 60:9,18,19 74:3,9,13 75:5,11 75:12 85:1 90:3 92:13 initial 21:3 42:2 43:3,7,18 52:13 initials 43:19 innocent 48:5 inquiries 79:11 insist 53:1 insisted 52:20 56:25 insistence 54:7 insisting 22:5 55:15 instance 16:20 22:20 41:4 85:10 instances 22:17 67:19 instant 51:13 insufficient 9:8 intend 23:4 58:23 intended 43:16 55:2 55:4 62:21 intent 75:10 intention 24:1 76:14,19 intentionally 34:1 interest 21:5 25:9 40:21 59:6,13 85:20 interesting 27:14 28:1 interests 17:2 interfere 86:4 interjected 75:19 interrupt 25:21 intrusion 38:9 59:13	investment 1:8,14 2:5 4:14 investments 61:23 investor 1:5 investors 48:5 invited 80:21 involved 36:1 80:11 84:3 iron 78:8,9 irrelevant 17:19 31:20 37:24 57:8 58:2,3 75:15,16 irving 1:13 2:4 4:13 issue 9:19 10:10 11:12,18 12:12,12 13:12 14:2,6 15:5 17:13 18:13,14 19:9 23:22 26:17,22,23 28:7,13 31:21 32:10 38:20 42:19 43:6 44:13,23 45:14,22 46:10,10,11,12 47:4 47:5,8,19 48:10,11 48:12,14,23 50:20 58:5 63:3,6,14 69:5 73:17 74:17,18 76:11 77:24 80:3,11 83:15 85:5 86:5,7 90:21,21 91:4 92:1 92:16 issued 35:20 57:22 issues 16:4,5 22:15 45:13 48:11,23 49:2 51:14 56:10 68:18 82:4 86:11,12,18 it'll 17:6 73:2	72:4 jim 25:15 job 46:15 john 61:25 joint 25:16,25 26:14 26:14 27:4,8 61:2,6 judge 2:25 25:2 43:6 72:3 76:16 judging 58:8 judgment 24:2 june 70:1 jury 42:21,23 justify 54:9
			k karin 4:22 keep 48:9,9 81:3 keeps 44:11 kevin 5:18 kind 14:11 kinds 46:3 kirby 80:13,15,22 89:22 knew 48:1 82:12,13 know 7:13 15:1,13 15:25 16:19 18:2,10 19:1,2,4 20:7,22 21:11 35:24 38:12 43:12 44:4 45:19,25 48:9,22 63:19 64:25 65:9 67:11,21 68:6 68:8 72:21 74:6,16 76:3 77:24 82:6,12 83:6,6,8,9 84:20 85:10 86:23 87:16 89:24 92:3 knowledge 36:5 81:23 82:3 83:24 84:2 knowledgeable 36:6 84:8,19 known 48:7,7 knows 13:8 23:8 42:23 83:9 krause 5:1 kwon 5:14

[I - motors]

Page 10

I	m	mention
1 1:8,13 2:4 3:5 4:14 59:7	liabilities 61:5 liability 58:20 light 39:14 limit 75:8 limitation 90:22 limitations 78:6,10 81:1 87:5 88:9,16 90:5	52:12 82:16
laboring 87:10 lack 57:25 58:24 lacked 36:5 lacks 57:21 laid 73:19 langford 57:19 language 33:14 76:24 77:1,2,4 large 60:21 85:6 late 70:8 83:3 latitude 92:19 law 14:10 18:7,11 20:9 41:24 43:1 49:5 58:21 63:12 80:11 92:18 lawrence 1:17 4:4 9:4,24 11:1 14:8 25:6,12,15,22 26:24 28:18 39:8 40:2 52:3,12 54:3,22 55:13 56:3 58:19 60:23,24 61:2,3,6 62:14 63:10 69:21 lawrence's 60:25 62:16	madoff 1:8,14 2:5 3:5 4:14 6:2,5,12 25:8 37:9,13 48:1 61:4,10,19 70:22 73:14,16 74:2,6,7 74:12,23 75:24 77:8 78:5 82:11,17 84:13 84:14,20 90:5 92:4 92:10	52:17 54:3 55:22 64:16
lawyer 6:11 lawyers 29:13 leading 30:25 learned 65:20 leave 40:24 72:9,11 72:12 75:1 78:4 leaves 37:4 ledanski 3:25 95:3 95:8	madoff's 81:22 maintain 69:10 man 63:19 70:11 march 2:16 11:9,23 32:12 37:6 95:25	47:3
legal 14:2 95:20 legitimately 27:10 letter 8:22 21:23,24 32:7 51:1 52:3 57:1 82:19	marcy 5:13 mark 46:2 71:11 marked 79:18 match 65:24 matter 6:16 19:14 19:25 22:18 30:1 38:18 57:15 58:21 73:5,7,8,15 74:20 75:13,20 77:16,16 82:16 86:17 92:13	5:14
letters 8:15 53:25 54:24 56:24 57:1 letting 43:14 level 47:24	matters 9:23 70:19 75:6	25:10
	mckenzie 80:14 mcwane 59:16,19	25:11
	mean 7:2 15:14 16:25 24:25 31:12 31:18 34:22 35:5 38:3 40:1,7 47:14 91:2,9	25:12
	meaningful 9:1 34:2	25:13
	meaningless 23:25	25:14
	means 15:14 42:14	25:15
	meant 74:7	25:16
	mediator 16:23,24	25:17
	meet 51:13 55:6 56:16,19 60:10	25:18
	members 21:10	25:19
	memorialized 8:8 55:5	25:20
		25:21
		25:22
		25:23
		25:24
		25:25
		26:1
		26:2
		26:3
		26:4
		26:5
		26:6
		26:7
		26:8
		26:9
		26:10
		26:11
		26:12
		26:13
		26:14
		26:15
		26:16
		26:17
		26:18
		26:19
		26:20
		26:21
		26:22
		26:23
		26:24
		26:25
		27:1
		27:2
		27:3
		27:4
		27:5
		27:6
		27:7
		27:8
		27:9
		27:10
		27:11
		27:12
		27:13
		27:14
		27:15
		27:16
		27:17
		27:18
		27:19
		27:20
		27:21
		27:22
		27:23
		27:24
		27:25
		28:1
		28:2
		28:3
		28:4
		28:5
		28:6
		28:7
		28:8
		28:9
		28:10
		28:11
		28:12
		28:13
		28:14
		28:15
		28:16
		28:17
		28:18
		28:19
		28:20
		28:21
		28:22
		28:23
		28:24
		28:25
		29:1
		29:2
		29:3
		29:4
		29:5
		29:6
		29:7
		29:8
		29:9
		29:10
		29:11
		29:12
		29:13
		29:14
		29:15
		29:16
		29:17
		29:18
		29:19
		29:20
		29:21
		29:22
		29:23
		29:24
		29:25
		30:1
		30:2
		30:3
		30:4
		30:5
		30:6
		30:7
		30:8
		30:9
		30:10
		30:11
		30:12
		30:13
		30:14
		30:15
		30:16
		30:17
		30:18
		30:19
		30:20
		30:21
		30:22
		30:23
		30:24
		30:25
		31:1
		31:2
		31:3
		31:4
		31:5
		31:6
		31:7
		31:8
		31:9
		31:10
		31:11
		31:12
		31:13
		31:14
		31:15
		31:16
		31:17
		31:18
		31:19
		31:20
		31:21
		31:22
		31:23
		31:24
		31:25
		32:1
		32:2
		32:3
		32:4
		32:5
		32:6
		32:7
		32:8
		32:9
		32:10
		32:11
		32:12
		32:13
		32:14
		32:15
		32:16
		32:17
		32:18
		32:19
		32:20
		32:21
		32:22
		32:23
		32:24
		32:25
		33:1
		33:2
		33:3
		33:4
		33:5
		33:6
		33:7
		33:8
		33:9
		33:10
		33:11
		33:12
		33:13
		33:14
		33:15
		33:16
		33:17
		33:18
		33:19
		33:20
		33:21
		33:22
		33:23
		33:24
		33:25
		34:1
		34:2
		34:3
		34:4
		34:5
		34:6
		34:7
		34:8
		34:9
		34:10
		34:11
		34:12
		34:13
		34:14
		34:15
		34:16
		34:17
		34:18
		34:19
		34:20
		34:21
		34:22
		34:23
		34:24
		34:25
		35:1
		35:2
		35:3
		35:4
		35:5
		35:6
		35:7
		35:8
		35:9
		35:10
		35:11
		35:12
		35:13
		35:14
		35:15
		35:16
		35:17
		35:18
		35:19
		35:20
		35:21
		35:22
		35:23
		35:24
		35:25
		36:1
		36:2
		36:3
		36:4
		36:5
		36:6
		36:7
		36:8
		36:9
		36:10
		36:11
		36:12
		36:13
		36:14
		36:15
		36:16
		36:17
		36:18
		36:19
		36:20
		36:21
		36:22
		36:23
		36:24
		36:25
		37:1
		37:2
		37:3
		37:4
		37:5
		37:6
		37:7
		37:8
		37:9
		37:10
		37:11
		37:12
		37:13
		37:14
		37:15
		37:16
		37:17
		37:18
		37:19
		37:20
		37:21
		37:22
		37:23
		37:24
		37:25
		38:1
		38:2
		38:3
		38:4
		38:5
		38:6
		38:7
		38:8
		38:9
		38:10
		38:11
		38:12
		38:13
		38:14
		38:15
		38:16
		38:17
		38:18
		38:19
		38:20
		38:21
		38:22
		38:23
		38:24
		38:25
		39:1
		39:2
		39:3
		39:4
		39:5
		39:6
		39:7
		39:8
		39:9
		39:10
		39:11
		39:12
		39:13
		39:14
		39:15
		39:16
		39:17
		39:18
		39:19
		39:20
		39:21
		39:22
		39:23
		39:24
		39:25
		40:1
		40:2
		40:3
		40:4
		40:5
		40:6
		40:7
		40:8
		40:9
		40:10
		40:11
		40:12
		40:13
		40:14
		40:15
		40:16
		40:17
		40:18
		40:19
		40:20
		40:21
		40:22
		40:23
		40:24
		40:25
		41:1
		41:2
		41:3
		41:4
		41:5
		41:6
		41:7
		41:8
		41:9
		41:10
		41:11
		41:12
		41:13
		41:14
		41:15
		41:16
		41:17
		41:18
		41:19
		41:20
		41:21
		41:22
		41:23
		41:24
		41:25
		42:1
		42:2
		42:3
		42:4
		42:5
		42:6
		42:7
		42:8
		42:9
		42:10
		42:11
		42:12
		42:13
		42:14

[movant - passed]

Page 11

movant 46:21	nova 57:23	89:19	outweigh 60:18
move 24:1 25:17	number 11:19,22	92:2	outweighs 62:3
29:20,21 44:12	11:22,25 12:5,15,16	old 95:21	overblown 75:15
45:12 51:5,18 54:15	25:5,5 35:17,19	omnibus 42:13	overlapped 6:22
moved 49:21 52:21	36:18 44:3 63:23,25	once 17:10 27:23	overstates 45:22
56:2,3	89:2,4	ones 78:23 79:13	owner 26:14
moving 46:21 56:15	numerous 38:7	88:12	owners 61:2
n			
n 4:1 6:1 59:7 94:1	ny 2:14 4:7,17 5:4	open 28:25 57:14	p
95:1	5:11 95:23	57:16 58:19 59:10	p 4:1,1 6:1
name 24:6	o		
names 41:10	o 2:23 6:1 95:1	opened 65:10	page 79:5 94:4
national 5:2 6:19	o'neal 43:25	operating 46:5	pages 89:3
10:21,25 25:7,11,14	object 17:17,22	opportunity 7:22	paid 39:11 46:12
61:1 70:24 71:9	18:8,19 26:24 30:22	8:1,11 9:1 19:17,22	58:8,10
national's 61:17	54:12 57:17 59:1	24:19 28:12 29:23	papers 41:22 88:25
nauseam 49:8	88:13,14,16	31:4 41:7 43:19	paragraph 61:8
necessarily 76:1	objection 31:1,22	53:3 79:17 85:21	74:21 90:3
84:18	37:11 47:6 67:17	87:6 88:6,14,18,24	paranoia 90:1
necessary 51:14,18	69:4 76:22,24 77:17	opposed 23:22	pardon 72:25
need 23:5,9 29:15	78:12,19 80:20	opposition 85:15	park 4:6
44:16 46:11 48:17	86:22	oral 9:22	part 7:16 57:13
48:18 65:3 66:22	objections 41:22	orally 24:22	58:14 81:6
69:2 77:1	77:2	order 3:2,8 6:5,17	parte 27:24
needed 28:25	obligations 92:18	8:4,6,7,16 17:5	participate 80:18
needs 20:20 87:9	obtain 37:13 38:6	24:21,24 25:4 27:4	89:22
negotiate 9:12	obtained 19:18	31:2 32:13,23 33:5	participating 80:23
neither 79:21	obvious 84:14	33:9,12 40:3 41:6	particular 22:20
neutral 16:22,24	obviously 29:2,25	42:17 43:4 45:1,24	47:19 74:22
62:7	63:6 66:24	46:5,7 51:17 52:5	particularly 12:23
never 12:14 14:16	occurred 50:17	52:25 53:9,11,14	80:2
21:11 22:25 41:9	73:22 85:6,11	54:8,13,16 55:2,5	parties 5:9 30:24
43:20 74:4,4 89:10	office 41:11	55:10,17,17 56:3,12	31:7 51:13 55:5
nevertheless 54:17	officer 46:6	56:23 60:23 61:7	56:15 57:22 59:3
new 1:2 2:14 4:7,17	offset 61:5	69:15,17,23 70:1	75:7 76:15,21 77:8
5:4,11 20:6 21:9	oh 20:17 36:25	71:10,12 72:20,23	77:10,15 78:21,23
29:12,13 45:15	43:17 64:23 70:21	73:2,3,12 75:9	78:25 79:8,22,22,23
67:20,20,24 68:5,22	73:1,13 80:10 86:14	76:18,23 78:9,15,17	80:2,3,9 85:21
non 57:18,22	okay 11:3 13:10,19	78:17,18 81:6,7,10	88:10 89:7 90:1,9
north 81:15 90:18	24:5 31:13 32:4	84:23 87:4,24 89:7	90:11
note 62:25	34:5 35:16 38:1	89:14,18 92:24	party 3:11 12:10
noted 63:15	42:7 44:7,18,24	order's 89:10	14:11,18 17:7,18
notice 69:10 87:4	64:23 67:1,25 69:9	ordered 25:2 46:4	18:8 24:11 45:9
noticed 49:13	69:15 70:14 71:14	orders 14:4 45:16	47:22 53:8 57:16,18
notwithstanding	72:18 73:13 74:11	88:4	57:21 58:22 59:2
90:1	76:2 79:4 81:11,17	ought 78:24	62:5,7
	83:4 84:22 85:18	outflows 15:2	party's 18:7
	87:18,21 88:23 89:9	outlined 84:24	passed 19:22

[pay - prove]

Page 12

pay 12:21 14:2,10 39:18 payment 15:3 payments 39:20 58:15 84:5,17 pending 19:24 20:3 28:4 55:11,15 73:8 87:13 penitentiary 81:16 people 17:2 26:19 47:25 48:4 74:5 84:10 percent 16:16 period 12:11 20:19 22:22 33:17 35:19 36:8 37:9 50:10 57:15,18 58:13 59:14 65:3,11,23 70:6 85:17,20 86:12 periods 85:7 permissible 27:12 61:25 permit 27:1 permitted 32:11 81:22 82:5 person 15:2,9 personal 16:15 17:23 18:6 27:6 31:19 33:21 35:10 48:6 59:6,11,18 81:23 82:3 personally 40:23 91:17 perspective 23:21 persuasion 59:3 perverted 23:21 phone 27:5 68:10 phraseology 88:13 picard 1:13 2:4 4:13 picower 5:9 74:18 74:21 75:6,11 76:15 76:21 77:8,10,15 78:21,23,25 79:1,6 79:11,16,23 80:3 85:15 88:10 89:6 90:1,3	place 44:1 71:11 plainly 59:20 plaintiff 1:6,15 2:6 plausible 42:5,9 playing 41:20 plaza 4:16 pleading 46:24,25 pleadings 89:3 please 6:2 9:9 12:15 12:16 89:2 pm 93:5 point 9:6,7 15:20 18:4 23:9,21 24:4 28:7 30:1 32:21 45:1 48:19,21 66:16 77:9,10 90:15,17 ponzi 26:19 popping 44:11 portion 58:22 59:15 posed 77:12 position 7:1 22:8 possible 7:10 16:11 power 24:25 practical 38:20 75:13 90:7 practice 30:25 53:13 practices 83:17,19 precise 36:8 precisely 27:25 predicated 8:3,14 8:17 preference 6:3 preferred 91:24 preparing 65:20 present 5:16 10:1 75:7 80:10 90:10,14 press 41:19 pressure 29:25 presumably 59:22 presume 80:17 pretty 79:1 prevent 74:22 75:4 preventing 31:2 60:20 previous 31:7	previously 52:1,9 principal 11:15,17 12:6,8 principle 20:9 49:4 49:6 91:1,8 prior 40:8 56:9 prison 82:12 84:11 90:8 privacy 18:14 32:10 44:11 45:12,14 46:10,10,11,12 47:3 47:5,8,24 48:10,12 59:2,6,9,13 60:13 60:17 62:3,12 privilege 57:16 privileged 57:15 61:25 privy 86:25 probably 38:20 74:13 problem 11:14 17:8 37:10 68:16 69:8 85:8 problems 66:11 67:11 procedural 8:19 20:1 32:15 procedure 8:5 14:16 27:13 31:10 34:21 52:23 57:11 91:6 procedures 9:10 24:17 91:5 proceed 6:16 7:14 8:13 9:16 20:1,12 30:20 33:7 72:8 74:25 proceeded 7:25 8:2 proceeding 19:19 19:24 20:3,3 27:24 28:4 31:3,5 42:19 50:21 76:18 77:15 80:24 proceedings 19:18 21:6 45:3 49:19,22 50:5 51:9 52:18 53:3 54:10 90:7,9	90:10 91:7 93:4 95:4 process 29:1 32:5 produce 10:22,25 15:24 16:8,14 17:10 33:19 38:13,25 65:16 66:6 70:24 71:20 produced 10:21,25 15:16 25:7,10 30:15 39:13 53:24 67:2 69:25 71:11 production 59:10 61:17,21 65:25 profit 73:17 74:17 77:14 80:11,23 81:23 82:16,23 83:6 85:3 86:7 90:22 91:3 profits 50:4,6 58:8 58:15 63:7 65:18 91:8 progress 86:5 prohibition 27:18 27:19 51:12 54:5 prohibitions 27:15 promise 17:8 propose 65:19 68:21 76:25 78:4 81:12 88:18 proposed 50:1,19 51:22 53:17 78:3,7 87:4,24 88:4,10,11 88:16,19 proposing 80:1 protect 17:1 18:25 61:25 protected 57:15 protection 1:5 17:5 protective 3:2 6:17 45:16 46:5 51:17 52:5 54:13,16 55:2 55:16,17 56:3,12,23 57:3 60:23 61:7 69:23 70:1 71:10 prove 10:8 13:13 15:15 60:3,8,9
---	---	---	--

[prove - relevant]

Page 13

61:13 62:19 90:23 proved 90:23 provide 8:11 9:1 34:2 69:11 77:5 provided 31:4 33:16 34:25 69:9 86:16 providing 7:22 proving 10:8 provisions 85:15 public 85:19 purpose 26:25 32:6 35:3 61:15 62:20 86:21 91:16 purposes 56:19 70:15 pursuant 17:5 28:10 52:21 56:7 69:25 pursue 23:11 put 12:11,12 14:12 15:23 25:25 31:1 58:4 62:18 63:3 72:20 74:20 75:16 88:13 puts 13:6 63:13 putting 32:10 42:16 pw 92:8	questioned 36:11 questions 9:2 17:17 35:3 76:14,19 77:12 80:6 quite 12:19,22 18:11 20:7 24:1 26:18 40:19 46:3 75:15 quote 57:14,15,16 57:18 58:19,22 59:10,14	recall 9:13 35:21 recalls 22:12 recanted 33:25 receipt 11:7 13:14 37:2,3 39:17 63:2 63:13,24,25 64:14 64:17 65:2 receipts 64:13,20 receive 12:21 13:20 14:2,4,11 22:25 26:19 63:4 received 10:16 11:21,24 12:14 13:23 15:5 26:11 54:21 65:4,5 68:10 85:24 receiving 64:16 recipient 58:20 recognized 59:5 recollection 36:21 recompute 91:1 reconstruct 85:5 record 14:19 18:23 24:17 31:1 39:11 40:8 51:11,15 71:20 83:7 95:4 record's 70:23 records 6:25 7:4 10:3,7,9,12,12,13 10:14,18,24 11:6 12:12 13:22 15:7 16:16 17:10,23 18:6 18:11 23:2,6,8 25:11,16 26:25 27:3 27:4,7,7,10 31:19 32:11 33:19 35:10 37:5,6,8,14,19 38:7 39:1,1,10,12,12,13 42:24 43:15,20 46:15 47:10,18 48:6 50:23 58:1,2 59:24 60:1,2,4,6,12,13,14 60:25 61:1,12,14,18 62:3,6,7,10,17,19 64:21 65:4,8,23,24 65:25 66:6,7,17,18 66:22,23 67:2 69:10	70:16 73:11 83:11 85:3,7,12 91:18 recover 50:5 59:21 63:8 91:7 redact 46:2 redacted 47:10,20 61:18 62:5 redaction 62:10,11 85:21 86:13,16 87:8 87:13,14 redactions 61:21 77:11 reducing 66:11 referred 52:3 reflect 42:24 reflected 7:11 13:21 reflecting 25:8 refrain 55:7,8 refund 39:19 refunded 58:14 refunds 12:23 39:18 61:4 refusal 54:9 60:6 regard 23:1,3,10 42:1 regarding 6:10 10:15 38:11 47:20 52:1 54:5 76:15 reinvest 82:22 reiterated 51:11 related 6:9 14:21 61:4,19 75:11 76:1 90:21 relating 50:9,20 52:18 53:4 61:4 74:21 75:5 released 34:20 relevance 18:9,10 25:19 59:12 60:18 62:2 90:6 relevancy 57:22 60:11 relevant 14:25 16:17 20:19 33:17 33:18,19 36:16 37:9 37:24 38:1,2,8,23 50:23 57:13 59:18
q quality 34:10 quash 3:1 25:18 46:21 54:16 55:16 56:1,2,3,11,13 57:3 57:5,12,13 58:1 59:3 69:22 quashed 6:17 59:16 quashing 53:22 queried 23:4 question 9:21,23 13:25 14:1,1,13 16:20 20:22 23:15 23:16 26:11,12,20 27:14 28:1 34:24 39:16 42:18 49:3,10 63:23 68:15 71:9 75:2,3 77:9 83:2	reader 61:22 realize 82:15 really 6:18,20 13:8 29:25 33:9 38:5,6 45:23 46:20 71:25 74:7 77:18 80:3 83:2 88:12,15 92:15 reason 9:9 22:8,9 22:12 33:20,24 42:23,23 43:11 44:10 62:8,21 73:21 74:19,19 reasonable 92:15 reasonably 92:12 reasons 50:2 67:14 83:20	10:3,7,9,12,12,13 10:14,18,24 11:6 12:12 13:22 15:7 16:16 17:10,23 18:6 18:11 23:2,6,8 25:11,16 26:25 27:3 27:4,7,7,10 31:19 32:11 33:19 35:10 37:5,6,8,14,19 38:7 39:1,1,10,12,12,13 42:24 43:15,20 46:15 47:10,18 48:6 50:23 58:1,2 59:24 60:1,2,4,6,12,13,14 60:25 61:1,12,14,18 62:3,6,7,10,17,19 64:21 65:4,8,23,24 65:25 66:6,7,17,18 66:22,23 67:2 69:10	10:15 38:11 47:20 52:1 54:5 76:15 reinvest 82:22 reiterated 51:11 related 6:9 14:21 61:4,19 75:11 76:1 90:21 relating 50:9,20 52:18 53:4 61:4 74:21 75:5 released 34:20 relevance 18:9,10 25:19 59:12 60:18 62:2 90:6 relevancy 57:22 60:11 relevant 14:25 16:17 20:19 33:17 33:18,19 36:16 37:9 37:24 38:1,2,8,23 50:23 57:13 59:18

[relevant - satisfied]

Page 14

59:20 65:16,23 85:2 reliance 92:15 relief 58:14 76:17 76:20 77:7 relies 92:12 relieve 55:2,4 rely 8:4 23:1 relying 23:7 remain 86:17 87:12 remedial 56:19 remedies 35:6,8 remedy 16:11 40:2 40:14 53:11 remember 36:7,17 36:18 89:21 renders 26:14 repeated 49:7 reply 77:25 88:15 88:18 89:25 reporting 70:7 reports 85:4 represent 6:15 18:24 19:4 representation 8:9 23:16 24:9 31:10,25 41:5 53:16,20 54:19 55:3 representations 8:18 33:25 49:22 52:24 62:22 representative 49:20 representatives 21:9 29:13 represented 20:13 50:15 67:13 representing 7:21 29:2,4 represents 6:13 92:8 request 7:12,23 8:12 12:5 13:5 14:3 21:12 22:11,25 23:9 25:13 31:25 33:2,5 36:12 37:17 38:21 49:25 50:19 51:8 52:11,13 53:18	54:20 55:18,21,23 60:22 61:10,15 62:11 63:25 64:7 67:9,10 82:18 83:7 84:23 86:16 87:9 requested 37:16 55:10 83:25 requests 7:24 8:1 9:4 22:6,10,13,16 22:24 23:17 28:9 29:15,23 30:2,11 31:4,16 34:13,22 35:6 39:2 51:23 52:10,17 53:5 58:9 67:15 78:21 85:22 86:19 87:11,14,14 87:17,17 require 13:6 62:18 90:25 required 14:10,17 33:2 39:2 54:11 56:15 58:21 63:12 requirement 15:3 69:24 requirements 55:5 56:18,20 87:2 requires 10:8 32:24 57:14 61:13 resolution 29:8,21 55:11 68:18 87:13 resolve 11:1 22:15 68:3 78:16 resolved 10:20 55:9 70:19 73:10 78:18 86:11,18 87:17 respect 12:25 46:19 49:2 62:13,25 63:15 67:7 68:21 69:20 70:4,5 73:17 91:6 respectfully 23:13 23:23 90:4 respective 36:3 respond 32:2 33:6 49:13 52:9 54:23 55:21 86:24 87:6 88:8	responded 55:18 responding 12:9 responds 14:7 response 25:12 39:14 53:4 63:24 65:16 79:2,8 89:25 responses 7:12 9:4 9:12 32:8 37:2 52:13,14 54:4,21 55:14 58:9 61:10 62:23 65:6 ressler 5:13 78:22 79:3,5,8,12,15 80:5 81:5,11 85:23 86:2 86:10,15,19,25 87:22 89:16,20 93:1 restraining 3:8 32:13 restrictions 87:5 result 51:10 81:7 results 85:6 return 64:1 returned 64:14 reveal 16:15 19:2 82:10 revealed 81:22 reversed 21:18 review 77:2 79:17 richard 4:20 80:14 rid 43:20 right 7:10 10:3,4,17 13:23 18:15,18 20:10,14,18 21:16 22:3 23:11 24:5,5 27:9 28:24 29:4,14 30:5,7 32:2,19,23 35:2,11,15 37:4,15 37:22,23 39:4 40:1 40:12 42:6,22 43:21 45:6 46:13,17 47:5 49:18 59:9 60:12 65:12 67:20 68:19 68:24 69:4,20 70:2 70:21 71:25 72:5 73:13,15 76:7 79:12 80:25 81:3 87:3,19 88:17 89:13,21	92:11,13,24 rights 20:1 road 95:21 robert 11:19,21,24 rockefeller 4:16 roman 11:4,21,25 55:14 69:21 roman's 11:19 romans 12:25 13:7 13:8 53:24 62:25 roth 2:8 3:14 5:8 6:11 28:19,19 29:1 29:18,19 52:2 55:18 67:8,9,19 68:5,6,9 68:10,21 69:6,14,18 70:5 route 33:25 rule 19:15,21,24 20:3 23:13,14 27:12 27:15,17,21 28:10 35:5,7,8,8 38:4 return 64:1 41:23 42:7 43:14,22 44:3 45:1,7 46:24 46:25 53:7,11 56:7 56:8 57:11 ruled 47:7 76:16 88:4,20,22 rules 8:4,5 14:15 27:13 38:4 52:22,22 53:9 ruling 8:7 28:5 32:12 rulings 94:3 run 76:18
s			
s 4:1,22 6:1 sanctions 53:8 55:12 81:8 saren 1:17 4:4 9:3 9:24 11:1 14:8 25:12 28:18 39:8 40:2 52:2,12 54:3 54:22 55:13 58:18 60:24 62:14,16 63:10 69:21 satisfied 18:23 35:7 46:24 65:24 66:3			

[satisfied - status]

Page 15

91:17	seeking 7:5 14:24	shared 87:15	sons 61:25
saw 84:9	17:18 21:14 31:19	she'd 10:16	sonya 3:25 95:3,8
saying 12:13,15	48:5 50:9 55:19	shed 39:14	sooner 56:15
25:2 27:11 30:21	56:5 59:3,18,21	sheehan 4:19 6:3,8	sorry 22:2 35:20
31:22 33:8 34:5,7	63:20 76:21 91:7	21:2,7,13,16,20	48:19 63:22 68:7
37:21 41:25 47:9	seeks 17:23 25:18	22:2,8 23:20 29:1,6	70:23 73:1 74:24
67:12	59:10 61:5	29:14,19 30:5 40:18	sort 8:19 21:4 28:20
says 12:1,5,14 13:10	seen 17:6	41:12 42:20 43:8,11	75:12 78:8
18:11 30:13,13 33:2	self 81:9	44:6,8,15,19,24	sought 21:24 39:12
33:5 34:3 40:9	send 35:9 72:23	45:4,7,10 47:3	59:12 77:7
61:18 73:24 90:3	82:19,22 83:7,25	49:11,12,15,17 67:6	source 74:3
92:3,5,6	sending 67:15 82:24	67:18,23 68:1,3,6,8	southern 1:2
schedule 84:10	84:4,5	68:19,22,25 69:8,12	specific 20:10 36:5
scheme 26:19	sense 46:10 47:2	70:3,13,17,20 71:13	56:9 62:10,13 77:4
schulte 5:8	77:25	71:23 72:3,24 73:1	79:10
scope 75:9 77:3	sent 8:15	73:6,9	specifically 13:14
78:6 88:19 90:16,19	series 22:20	short 81:14,25	25:6 74:18 77:2
sdny 57:24 59:5,8	serve 22:11,12	show 6:5 10:9 17:7	83:11,23
61:24 62:1	31:18 33:2,5 34:21	60:17 61:18 62:6,7	spectrum 84:15
seal 80:2 86:20	34:23 50:16 67:9	62:8	spirit 78:6
87:14	served 9:5,13 21:12	showing 17:8	split 86:8
sealing 87:2	21:23 22:4,6,15	shown 56:14 82:3	spoliation 50:16
seanna 4:21 76:9	23:17 30:10,10,11	side 39:6 76:8 86:23	spouse 60:23
seated 6:2	31:24 38:22 39:3,5	sides 91:10	staff 45:18
sec 28:22	41:12 49:25 50:8,19	signed 55:5 75:24	stand 9:14 32:22,24
second 9:12 18:9	51:8,9 52:2,9,11,13	89:10	62:19
26:22 57:5,20 59:16	52:14,16,19 53:17	significant 12:13	standards 46:24,25
76:11 77:9 83:15	54:4,20 55:14,22	85:4	standing 17:17,22
92:17	service 22:23	similar 91:24	18:4,5,8,12,15,19
secondly 10:7	serving 22:9 31:15	simple 40:14	25:16,17 26:24
section 53:13	34:12 51:6	simplest 40:10	44:13,22 48:12,13
securities 1:5,8,14	set 9:12 31:10 66:24	simply 24:9 26:23	49:4 57:17,21 58:1
2:5 4:15	87:25 90:4	31:14 63:2	59:1
see 11:18,22,25	sets 57:11 78:20	sipa 4:14 91:16,19	standings 49:1
12:15,16 16:10	settle 87:4 88:1 89:7	91:23	start 44:9 76:11
20:17 21:23 36:21	89:14,17 92:24	sir 71:7	started 18:16
36:25 37:1 52:6	settled 73:7	sit 49:18	state 6:24 8:24
61:20 63:23 64:9,12	settlement 87:23	sitting 41:5	18:22 61:22
66:16 68:23 69:6	seven 34:3 79:9	situation 25:6	stated 51:15 54:10
78:25 86:22 92:23	shapiro 20:22 21:1	six 71:25 72:1	63:4 65:22
seeing 80:23	21:3,23 22:4 28:18	smb 1:3,11 2:2 3:1	statement 7:8 54:17
seek 6:25 32:1,11	28:21 29:12,12 30:8	3:4,7,10,13	54:25
35:8 45:1 49:23	31:24 32:13 52:2,11	solely 37:12	states 1:1 9:25
50:18 51:21 54:19	52:18 55:23 67:7,10	solution 65:20 66:3	27:16 57:12 66:9
55:6 56:16,22 62:9	67:11,20 68:8 69:3	solutions 95:20	status 21:5,25 22:1
72:13 75:10	69:6 70:5	somebody 15:5	28:19 91:24
		80:17 82:12,18,21	

[stay - thought]

Page 16

stay 3:8 54:5 72:13 72:15,19,20 73:3	55:25 56:2,6,9,23 57:5,22 58:1 59:2,4 59:19 62:13,14,24 63:21 64:18,24 65:16 69:22	subsequence 23:3 42:1	thank 24:8 40:16 46:16 49:18 52:19 67:3 71:5 72:3,4,16 72:22 87:20,22 92:25 93:1,2,3
stayed 55:10	59:19 62:13,14,24	suspicion 61:21	theory 12:20 14:12 28:3 53:15 58:2 64:17 82:23
steps 56:5	63:21 64:18,24	sustain 60:16	theses 31:18
stipulation 50:19 51:23 53:18	65:16 69:22	t	thing 26:5 29:11 30:8 39:7 40:11 46:9 69:2 72:6 76:13
stipulations 22:17 50:1	subsequent 17:12 17:19 18:1,17,20,24 19:8,14 23:12 25:20 25:24 26:3,15,23 42:13,24 43:9,10 44:12 46:23 48:7,10 48:13 49:9 57:7,9 58:3,4 63:13 90:24	take 3:4 11:3 15:20 18:4 27:1,12,24 43:24 63:23 71:20 75:4 81:12,15 83:8 90:16	things 6:4,8 11:17 23:9,17 29:23 30:6 33:2 34:8 38:25 42:4 46:3 49:21 75:25
stop 15:19 41:18	subsequently 58:25	taken 88:2	think 9:8,11 12:20 13:3,16,16 16:22 19:7 20:15,19 23:13 24:2,14,16 25:1 26:17,21 28:6,8 30:8 31:1,14,17 32:23 33:4 34:25
straight 14:3	subsequents 42:15	talk 13:1 68:22	35:25 36:14,19 39:4 40:6,7,19,22 41:10 41:21 42:12,21 43:16,21 44:13,15 44:22 45:11,14,21 47:14,24 48:25 49:10,15 63:21 64:20 65:4 68:8 70:1 74:7,12 76:5,6 78:20,22 80:5,10 82:2,4,8 83:20 84:3 84:6 85:1,25 88:11 90:15 91:21,22 92:10,17,21
street 61:22	substance 13:4	talked 28:17,18,18	third 3:10 5:10 14:11 17:7,18 18:8 45:9 47:21 58:22 59:1,2 62:4,7 77:10
strict 22:14 56:17	substantial 7:11	talking 17:25,25 18:16,17 20:15 35:19 45:23 85:9	tell 7:9,16,18 12:18 15:20 40:10 72:24 91:14
stuart 2:24	substantially 7:6	18:16,17 20:15 39:11,18 58:8,10	telling 20:2 23:18 66:18
stuff 46:2	substantiate 91:24	tells 32:4	44:22 45:11,14,21 47:14,24 48:25 49:10,15 63:21 64:20 65:4 68:8 70:1 74:7,12 76:5,6 78:20,22 80:5,10 82:2,4,8 83:20 84:3 84:6 85:1,25 88:11 90:15 91:21,22 92:10,17,21
subject 69:24 80:25 87:1	substantive 33:16	temerity 40:23	temporary 3:7 32:13
submission 65:21 66:10,13	substitute 61:20	ten 71:21 85:9,11	32:13
submit 69:15,17 83:17 88:18 89:3	sue 43:9	tend 32:5	thought 18:23 63:17 64:19 74:5 89:15
submitted 82:16 90:2	sued 43:10	term 11:14	
subpoena 3:2,11 14:19 17:18,23 18:8 21:25 24:18 25:18 26:25 31:22 32:20 34:4 35:9 37:8,11 38:24 39:12,14 40:4 41:7,12 46:22 50:22 51:4,6 52:4 53:17 53:22 54:6 56:4 57:12,14,17 59:10 59:15 60:25 66:5 68:21 69:2	suffer 53:6	terms 13:7 47:3 87:25	
subpoenaed 18:12 25:17 27:6,7 51:12 57:3 60:25 61:12	sufficient 35:1 56:6	territory 26:22	
subpoenas 3:8 6:10 6:13,25 7:5,9,21 8:10 14:24 21:15 22:4,6 29:22 30:11 30:18 31:3,6,6,15 31:18,23 32:1 33:7 39:5 49:24 50:8,13 50:16,18 51:9,16,22 52:1,19 53:2,25 54:8,11,16,20 55:1	suggest 41:25	testifies 83:5	
	suggested 62:15	testify 83:16,24	
	suggesting 43:14	testimony 75:9 77:8 77:13 83:10 90:6	
	suggestion 41:1 62:4		
	suggests 43:1		
	suit 19:23		
	suite 95:22		
	summary 24:2 77:5		
	support 16:9 26:3 61:7		
	supporting 53:20		
	suppose 80:4,6 82:21 90:21 92:3		
	supposed 70:8		
	supposedly 53:15 85:11		
	supreme 27:16		
	sure 12:19,22 25:23 28:17 47:7 48:13		

[thousands - waited]

Page 17

thousands 17:2	transferred 50:6	56:19,22,25 59:17	understanding
three 6:8,9 10:19	58:25	59:21 60:3,7,8,19	21:17 30:9,24 31:7
22:22 25:11 35:25	transfers 9:17,25	60:24 61:13 62:8,10	32:14 88:15
50:10 63:16 65:11	10:14 14:13,14	62:18,23 65:21	undue 57:23
time 22:11 29:3,7	17:12 18:1 20:16,18	73:20,25 76:10,20	united 1:1 27:16
29:10,16,20 30:15	25:8 33:18,19 34:19	85:5 88:11 89:7	universe 15:1 37:14
32:2 37:9 38:17	36:4,5,7 37:3,8,13	91:5 92:3,12,19	universitas 57:23
39:1 52:9 54:23	37:16 38:16 50:20	trustee's 3:10 7:20	unnecessary 33:21
55:21 65:23 67:15	50:22 53:4 58:5	8:8 11:5 12:12	unredacted 61:20
71:18 85:17,20	59:21,23 60:7,9,16	13:13,21 17:3,6	67:2
timing 56:18 57:2	61:4,10,11,14,16,19	23:2 25:9 33:23	unsatisfactory
68:17	62:15,19,20,23 63:1	36:11 37:21 38:24	54:21
today 22:9,25 28:13	63:2,3,3,14,16,17	50:12,15,25 51:5,20	untimely 56:13
29:9,21 30:2 40:18	64:3 65:17	52:13 54:18 59:24	upheld 59:19
44:22 45:9,21 68:13	treat 28:9 60:19	60:1,14 62:22 63:7	urgency 32:21
68:17 73:2 77:24	tri 24:11	78:19 79:13 80:5	use 14:2 17:11 23:5
84:24	trial 15:20,23,24	91:16 92:18	27:12 43:14 49:8
told 12:23 21:20	tro 21:22	trustees 13:20 36:1	70:7 79:19,22 80:17
44:1 51:5 64:20	true 16:19 32:16	54:7 73:23	90:8 92:11
67:8	34:15 41:3 69:3	trusts 36:1,2,3	uses 12:21
tossed 40:21	82:2 95:4	turn 51:5 78:24	usually 57:17
totally 30:23 75:15	trust 36:2,5,7,17,23	turned 22:20 47:10	v
trace 26:4	61:22 64:16	62:10 73:11	v 1:7,16 2:7
transaction 91:13	trustee 1:13 2:4	turning 56:9	valid 24:3
91:19	4:13 6:18 7:1,24	tv 41:15	valley 5:2 6:19
transactions 16:17	8:2,10,25 9:7,11,14	two 6:4 12:13 20:16	10:21,25 25:7,10,14
81:24 82:25 84:17	9:15,16 10:8,11,18	23:9 25:5 35:17,19	61:1,17 70:24 71:8
transcribed 3:25	12:9 13:6,8,13 14:7	36:1,2,9,13,20 40:6	value 32:8 45:21
transcript 51:17	14:7 15:20 16:10	43:2 48:11,23 50:6	various 55:24 87:4
77:10,13 79:17,20	17:4,8,11 19:13,16	50:10 63:15 65:3,4	veritext 95:20
79:22 80:1,17 85:16	19:17 20:16,20,25	65:11 91:10	versus 57:19,23
87:12 95:4	24:13,22,23,24,25	type 14:12	59:4,16 62:1
transcripts 24:20	26:17 27:1,5,6,9,10	u	vexing 45:15
transfer 17:19	27:11,20 28:3 30:11	u.s. 2:12,25	viability 22:14
18:17,20 43:3,7	31:2,9,15,17,23,24	ultimately 47:21	violate 28:4 54:8
57:7,9 58:3,21	32:4,9,22,24 33:2,5	63:8	violated 8:6 52:24
60:15 63:12 90:24	33:8,20 34:3,6,11	un 47:9	53:15,15 54:2
90:25 91:20 92:14	34:12,20 35:7 36:2	unacceptable 62:5	violating 53:20
92:20	36:2,3,4,4,6,14,16	uncharted 26:22	violation 8:4
transferee 19:8,14	36:23 37:7,23 38:6	unclear 89:11	violations 49:22
25:20,25 26:4,15,23	38:10 39:3 40:16,21	underlay 31:10	81:7
42:2,25 43:9,10,18	44:19 46:4,15,24	underlying 92:22	void 43:7
44:13 46:23 48:7,10	47:10,15 48:5 49:23	understand 11:16	w
48:14	49:25 50:4,8 51:2,7	12:22 19:21 21:1,8	wait 20:17 43:4,18
transferees 18:24	51:16,25 52:4,16,24	44:15 45:10 66:2,7	waited 19:17
21:3 23:12 49:9	53:15,21 54:14,23	71:2,10	
50:3	55:3,12,15,20 56:4		

[waived - zeichner]

Page 18

waived 14:18	wit 53:16	worth 63:5 83:9
walk 42:4	withdraw 3:13 6:11 22:23 24:14 39:24 55:19 66:5 68:12,14 69:14	write 82:18
want 13:1 14:19,20 24:7 28:9 32:16 35:12 38:6 66:16 67:22 68:17 76:13 78:16 79:16,21 81:6 81:18 89:6,8	withdrawal 11:8,9 11:20,23 13:21 15:10 73:17 74:17 77:14 80:11,23 81:24 82:18 86:7 90:22 91:4 92:9	writing 32:7 51:1
wanted 46:2 82:12 83:15	withdrawals 11:5 12:13 13:18 35:18 35:22 36:20 37:7,18 38:11 50:10 58:11 58:25 61:20 64:22 82:17,23 83:6 85:3 85:11 91:16,18	written 26:6
wants 41:2 55:20 73:4	withdrawing 23:19 23:20 29:2,15 67:8 69:18	wrong 21:20 24:15 41:2,19 90:22
waste 22:11 29:16 30:15 67:15	withdrawn 12:6 36:13 39:18 41:16 58:16 91:1	wrongful 7:20
way 13:17 14:8,24 22:4 32:15 38:5 45:24 46:13 74:13 77:11 91:10,18	withdraws 41:15 55:20	wrote 51:25 54:24
ways 15:11	witness 57:18 83:18	x
we've 22:19 28:6,17 28:18 29:6 41:2,19 41:21 46:13 67:14 67:21 73:19 84:23 87:5,25 91:9	witnesses 84:20	x 1:4,10,12,19 2:1,3 2:10 94:1
week 44:19 56:24 57:1	woman 41:13	y
weeks 43:2	wondering 21:5	yeah 6:7 11:7 35:24 40:15 46:5 67:23 73:9 79:4,7 83:10 84:7,25 86:22
weigh 83:13	word 46:18	year 35:19 50:10 65:3,11
weight 83:14,22	words 27:4,6 33:1 66:4 82:9 83:5 91:3 92:12	years 36:8,9,13 45:15,19,19,19 50:6 50:11 71:24,25 85:9 85:12
westlaw 57:24 59:8 61:24	work 43:25 68:23 68:25 71:16 87:7 89:20	yesterday 68:11
whatsoever 39:14 40:23 75:10	worked 22:19 31:11 31:14 32:5 33:13,15 33:22,24 34:5,10,23 67:13,21 69:7 74:5	york 1:2 2:14 4:7,17 5:4,11
whim 24:13	working 47:25 84:16	young 41:13
why'd 75:20	workings 84:4	z
wide 92:19	world 44:10 45:20 60:20	zabel 5:8
wife 43:24 44:2 61:2		zeichner 5:1
wife's 61:1,3		
wilentz 7:11 14:5,6 20:14,15,15,17 20:18 28:17 53:24 55:14 64:25 65:22 69:5 70:6		
wiley 61:25		
willing 37:7 62:6		